The Dissertation Committee for Lisa Kathryn Kearney
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

MEXICAN AMERICAN AND CAUCASIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT: THE INTERTWINING OF POWER AND CULTURE

Committee:

Lucia Gilbert, Supervisor

William Koch

Kristin Neff

Frank Richardson

Sherri Sanders

MEXICAN AMERICAN AND CAUCASIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT: THE INTERTWINING OF POWER AND CULTURE

by

Lisa Kathryn Kearney, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August, 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A vast number of people have made this project a reality and I am indebted to each one for their time, energy, and continued support. I first wish to thank those individuals who inspired this study. You embody courage with all you are. I applaud the valiant efforts you made to change a faulty system. In the process of your battle, you inspired me and changed my view of the world. This project is for you and all other women experiencing harassment in their educational institutions. I hope it offers you hope that you are not alone in your struggle to make universities a safer place for women pursuing a better tomorrow.

I next wish to thank my mentor and chair, Lucia Gilbert. Few students are blessed with a mentor who is truly invested in them as individuals. I am honored to have studied under you and worked beside you. Your lessons in research and in life are gifts which I will always carry with me. I hope someday to give to another young woman what you have given me.

To all my committee, I wish to extend my greatest thanks. Dr. Koch, you extended my love for statistics and made me want to continue my learning, the sign of a truly great teacher. Dr. Neff, your knowledge of culture and gender were such an asset to me, especially in the development of this project. I also wish to thank you for your assistance in data collection. Dr. Richardson, thank you for teaching me to question always and for bringing a richness to this project by challenging me to think constantly of the implications of my findings. Finally, Dr. Sanders, it has been a true joy to have you on this committee. You touch the lives of the very students I wish to aid in some small

way through this project. I hope these findings will assist you in your pursuit to make this campus a safer one for men and women alike.

A number of other faculty and students have also helped in this endeavor. I wish to thank Mindy Bravo for her constant encouragement, support, and guidance in this process and so many others. Your friendship has been such a blessing to me. I also wish to thank Kalina Brabeck for her help with data collection and her encouragement in my research pursuits. It is wonderful to have a colleague with such a passion for the same interests. Dr. Berndt, the "statistics goddess," thank you for first instilling in me a love for research and the world of statistics. I also wish to thank all the professors at the University of Texas at Brownsville and St. Mary's University who welcomed me into their classrooms. Thank you for honoring me with your time and support.

Finally, I wish to thank my family and friends. To my mother, the eternal proofreader, thank you for catching all my split infinitives, but most of all, for being such an encouragement to me. To my father, I wish to thank you for always believing in me and encouraging me to reach my highest goals. You both sacrificed greatly to give me such a wonderful educational foundation and I am ever thankful for that and so much more. Dave, I thank you for sharing my love for psychology and for being such a supportive brother. To my friends, Mary and Jenny, thank you for being patient and understanding of all the time I had to work this past year. To Milo and Vivian, thank you for all your help in Brownsville as I worked to collect my data. Kathleen, I wish to thank you specifically for always asking me about my project. It meant so much to have you be interested in my pursuits. To Sean, your patience through all these years of education

astounds me. You have made many, many sacrifices for me to pursue my dream. Thank you for loving me so much. Finally, to Ian, my beautiful little boy, you are our hearts' desire. Thank you for all the wonderful breaks to sit and watch you play during this process. You constantly remind me of what is truly important in this world. I hope this study in some small way makes the world a better place for you and your future friends.

MEXICAN AMERICAN AND CAUCASIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS'

EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT:

THE INTERTWINING OF POWER AND CULTURE

Publication No._____

Lisa Kathryn Kearney, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2004

Supervisor: Lucia Gilbert

While many studies have examined the sexual harassment of university students, little research has specifically addressed the sexual harassment of Mexican American university students. The main purpose of this study was to gather data about the harassment experiences of Mexican American female students and to investigate how their experiences compared to those of Caucasian female students. In particular, the study investigated students' responses to a subset of variables that illuminate the intertwining of power and culture in the experience of harassment. These variables included: 1) responses to harassing behavior, 2) perceptions of offenders' power, 3) attitudes toward harassment, and 4) the psychological effects of harassment. In accordance with power models of harassment, sex-role spillover theory, and minority marginalization theories, Mexican American students were hypothesized to experience more harassing behaviors,

more indirect responses to behavior, attribute greater power to offenders, be more tolerant of harassment, and experience more negative consequences.

Mexican American (n=261) and Caucasian female students (n=111) were recruited from three universities, including one university on the border of the United States and Mexico. Participants completed a packet of instruments measuring the frequency of harassing behaviors experienced, perceived power of the offender, attitudes towards harassment, chosen response to harassing behavior, post-traumatic stress and depression symptoms, and acculturation. Contrary to what was predicted, Caucasians reported experiencing more harassing behaviors than Mexican Americans and attributed greater power to offenders holding faculty/staff positions. Mexican Americans endorsed more tolerant attitudes and attributed greater power to student offenders. Both groups reported similar levels of negative psychological consequences and chose more indirect response styles. Acculturation was not found to be significantly associated with any factors. Rather than supporting minority vulnerability theories, these findings are more consistent with theories that view sexual harassment as a means of exhibiting and maintaining power. Recent research indicates that more egalitarian women experience greater harassment than traditional women. Since Caucasian women in the United States generally hold more egalitarian views of gender roles than Hispanic women, Caucasian university women may experience more harassing behaviors as a method of decreasing their power in society. Implications of these findings are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Despite increased awareness of sexual harassment in the last decade, harassment continues to be a pervasive problem for women on university campuses (Kalof, Eby, Matheson, & Kroska, 2001; Sandler & Shoop, 1997). In a review of harassment research on college students, Sandler and Shoop (1997) concluded that, on average, 20 to 30% of undergraduate women and 30 to 40% of graduate women had experienced harassing behaviors from faculty and staff and 70-90% of undergraduate women had experienced student-to-student harassment.

Research in the area of sexual harassment of university students has primarily focused on Caucasian samples. Some authors have hypothesized that women of color may experience greater rates of sexual harassment than Caucasian women due to increased power differentials, cultural norms, and economic differences (Gruber & Bjorn, 1986; Murrell, 1986; Segura, 1992). While some studies have examined the sexual harassment of African-American women (Mecca & Rubin, 1999; Shelton & Chavous, 1999), very little research has specifically addressed the sexual harassment of Mexican American university students. Projections suggest that Hispanics will be the largest minority population in the United States by the year 2050, constituting 21.1% of the population. This growth in population should also be reflected at the university level, with increasing numbers of Hispanic women attending college, making the study of harassment in this college population especially critical at this time (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992).

The main purpose of this dissertation study is to gather data about the sexual harassment experiences of Mexican American female students and to investigate how their experiences compare to those of Caucasian female students. In particular, this study investigates Mexican American and Caucasian students' responses to a subset of variables that illuminate the intertwining of power and culture in the experience of harassment. These variables include: 1) responses to harassing behavior, 2) perceptions of offenders' power, 3) attitudes toward harassment, and 4) the psychological effects of harassment.

A main objective of the dissertation study is to identify the prevalence of harassment in academic settings for Mexican American students in comparison to Caucasian female students. Mexican American women may be at greater risk for sexual harassment because of cultural views concerning the roles of women in society. For example, Hispanic women are taught that enduring suffering and becoming a martyr are characteristics of good women (Sue & Sue, 1999). As Hispanic women they are encouraged not to express anger and to be submissive to men, qualities that may put them at higher risk for harassment (Sue & Sue, 1999). Furthermore, the role of power becomes especially salient for Mexican American women. It is plausible that they are at a greater risk of being harassed because of the presence of two power differentials, being female and being a woman of color. Hence, they may be "doubly disadvantaged," possibly causing them to experience greater rates of sexual harassment.

A second objective of the study is to identify differences in responses to harassment chosen by Mexican American and Caucasian university students. Little research has focused upon the harassment response styles of women of color (Murrell,

1996). Cultural norms of sexual silence may cause Mexican American women to choose more indirect responses to harassment in order to avoid public embarrassment or disgrace for their involvement with sexual matters (Pavich, 1986). Fear of being shunned by society and a desire to remain pure in the eyes of others may lead Hispanic women to avoid seeking support from others. Likewise, cultural norms of submissiveness may further lead them not to report the behavior. Thus, they may be more likely to cope with harassment through non-assertive responses, such as avoiding the harasser or simply ignoring the behavior. Hence, responses to harassment by Mexican American women may appear quite different from responses chosen by Caucasian women.

A third objective is to identify the role of power in sexual harassment for Mexican American women in comparison to Caucasian women. Many researchers indicate that harassment is due largely to societal power differentials, which afford greater power to men than to women through physical size, financial status, and powerful professional and political roles (Hemming, 1985; Quina & Carlson, 1989; Skaine, 1996). While many researchers support this notion, little actual research has included power as a variable to be explored in sexual harassment studies (Cleveland & Kerst, 1993). Because minority individuals may be viewed as less powerful in society (Barak, 1997), the study of the role of power in harassment becomes especially pertinent when studying the experiences of Mexican American women, as culture and power may become intertwined in their experiences of sexually harassing behaviors.

A fourth objective is to assess differences in harassment tolerance between Mexican American women and Caucasian women in university settings. The machismo

culture, which encourages sexual exploration in men and submissiveness in women, may lead Mexican American women to be more tolerant of sexual harassment (Marin & Gomez, 1996; Pavich, 1986). Mexican culture further expects women to tolerate male sexual carousing, thereby possibly increasing Mexican women's tolerance of harassment. If they are indeed more tolerant of harassment, they may be deemed "better targets" by male harassers because they may be considered quiet individuals who will not complain about offensive behavior.

The final objective of this dissertation is to identify potential differences in the negative consequences of sexual harassment for Mexican American and Caucasian female university students. Sexually harassed women have been found to exhibit a number of psychological, physical, and academic consequences of the sexual harassment. For example, sexual harassment victims often experience increased depression and anxiety, decreased self esteem, more headaches, sleep disturbance, and problems concentrating (Holgate, 1989; Magley, Hulin, Fitzgerald, & Denardo, 1999; O'Donahue, 1997; Thacker & Gohmann, 1996). No studies have established whether or not Mexican American women experience greater negative effects than Caucasian women. The findings of this study could be used to create culturally specific prevention and treatment strategies to meet the unique needs of Mexican American women on university campuses in order to counteract these negative effects. By acknowledging how both power differentials and cultural differences interact with rates of, perceptions of, and responses to sexual harassment, faculty, staff, and students can work together to increase levels of gender and cultural sensitivity on campus, making campuses safer for women in general.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Sexual harassment is a large problem on university campuses in the United States (Kalof, et al., 2001; Sandler & Shoop, 1997). This problem has been attributed partially to the "systematically" sexist climate of many universities, where harassing behaviors are neither questions nor countered (Scollay & Bratt, 1997). Within such systems, young adult women may be at risk for experiencing such behaviors with scant knowledge of how to speak out against offensive behavior or meager desire to question authority (Dziech & Hawkins, 1998). Mexican American university students may be even more vulnerable to harassment because of cultural dynamics that promote female acquiescence to male authority. Cultural stereotypes may further exacerbate this problem by implying that Mexican American women desire sexual attention, are less sure of themselves, and are less powerful because of their minority status (DeFour, 1996; Paludi, 1996). A study that examines the prevalence and self-reported effects of sexual harassment among Mexican American and Caucasian female university students may provide information useful to universities making strides to reduce sexual harassment rates. Additionally, such information may be used to help improve the treatment of sexual harassment victims on college campuses.

This chapter provides a framework for the dissertation study and reviews literature in two main areas: theoretical explanations for sexual harassment and components of sexual harassment. In the theoretical section, two major theories are discussed: power theories and sex-role spillover theories. In the section on components of

sexual harassment, previous research is addressed in the following areas: prevalence of sexual harassment, tolerance of sexual harassment, responses to sexual harassment, and the negative consequences of sexual harassment. Each of these sections also describes culture-specific sexual harassment literature, which will lay a foundation for the study of the specific experience of sexual harassment in Mexican American university students.

Theoretical Explanations for Sexual Harassment

Two theoretical models are widely used for the explanation of sexual harassment: power theory and sex-role spillover theory.

Power Theories

Power explanations of sexual harassment are perhaps the most accepted theoretical models for sexual harassment research. Power models suggest that harassment exists because of power differentials between men and women, employers and employees, or faculty and students. According to this theory, sexual harassment is the result of the abuse of that power.

Gender and power. The concepts of sexual harassment and power are implicitly intertwined. MacKinnon (1979) first brought light to this connection by revealing the relationship between a sex stratification in society which fosters male power and the discrimination against women through sexual harassment. Her groundbreaking work on the abuse of power in harassment, alongside other studies and reports on harassment prevalence, helped provide the basis for the naming of sexual harassment as an illegal form of sex discrimination under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Gutek & Done, 2001).

Power has been defined in a variety of ways and can encompass a range of possibilities, extending from the ability to reward or punish someone to power held through knowledge and expertise. Davis (1991) defined power as the ability to exercise control over an individual in a particular situation. Power theories suggest that harassment occurs because inequalities exist between the sexes, causing men, in accordance with the power afforded them in a patriarchal society, to exhibit their power through engaging in sexually harassing behaviors (Hemming, 1985; Stockdale, 1996; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982).

In American culture, men have been provided greater power than women and have held it through physical strength, financial means, and societal institutions and gender biased practices (Quina & Carlson, 1989). Further, greater power has been legislated to men throughout United States history through the establishment of laws preventing women from voting or holding office, keeping women from obtaining power by political means (Quina & Carlson, 1989). Thus, the United States has been shown to bestow men with status and power; they are provided a culture of privilege (Stockdale, 1996). Hence, power imbalances exist between male and female students on college campuses, leaving women at risk for harassment.

Power also becomes apparent in academic situations where students are dependent upon professors for grades, letters of recommendation, future job opportunities, and campus reputations. Professors and other teaching staff, including teaching assistants and assistant instructors, may deem students as subordinates. Academia affords great power, as well as extensive autonomy, to professors, especially to

those who hold tenure (Skaine, 1996). Such power and autonomy cause professors to appear to be "untouchable," as nothing short of extreme misconduct will cause them to be dismissed. This stands in striking contrast to workplace situations, where individuals are dismissed for far less egregious events. Furthermore, faculty accountability is normally determined by chancellors, presidents, vice-presidents, deans, and department chairs, who are predominantly male (Dziech & Weiner, 1990). Such circumstances protect offenders because men are significantly more tolerant of harassment than women and may be more likely to overlook seemingly "minor" offenses (Ford & Donis, 1996; Jones & Remland, 1992). Stockdale (1996) stated that these power inequalities reflect society's patriarchal hierarchy in which men are afforded higher status and power than women. Tangri, et. al. (1982) thus suggested that organizational structures provide the basis for power inequalities, which, in turn, lay a foundation in which sexual harassment can occur.

However, one must note that while power differentials are inherent in systems, the abuse of power is not (Skaine, 1996). Hierarchical structures are necessary for organizations to function. Presidents, faculty members, and board chairs hold power to impact society positively. Yet when individuals are allotted greater power, they also have the ability to abuse that power. Those in power are more immune to societal accountability because they hold the authority to make decisions that vastly impact others and often have the financial resources to put such decisions into action. They are, in a sense, more protected than those in lower positions, thus granting them greater freedom to make decisions that either improve or harm the quality of life for others. Hence, they

are placed in circumstances which afford them the opportunity for sexual harassment, by means of their power and freedom.

While the majority of sexual harassment researchers acknowledge the implicit influence of power in sexual harassment, little research has included power as a variable to be studied. Cleveland and Kerst (1993) argued that a clarification of the role of power in sexual harassment must be established by including specific measures of power. DeFour (1996) suggested using French and Raven's (1959) conceptualization of power, commonly used in social psychology, in describing the influence of power in sexual harassment, but no study to date has done so.

French and Raven's conceptualization of power is based on the assumption that power relates to the ability of an individual to influence another (Nesler, Aguinis, Quigley, Lee, & Tedeschi, 1999). French and Raven (1959) described six types of interpersonal power: reward power, coercive power, referent power, legitimate power, expert power, and informational power. Reward power is the ability to ensure positive outcomes or decrease negative consequences for an individual. Coercive power, however, is power based on the belief that one can punish him/herself for failure to comply. Referent power is concerned with an individual's feeling of identification with another and the hope of maintaining that similarity. Legitimate power is founded in a belief that another has earned the right to dictate and to expect obedience. Expert power, on the other hand, rests on the belief that another possesses greater skills or knowledge. Lastly, informational power is rooted in valuing another's communication, logic, and reasoning

abilities (French & Raven, 1959). Individuals may have high power in some areas, but not others, but the greater the basis of power in all areas, the greater the overall power.

Several scales have been developed to measure French and Raven's power bases (Frost & Stahelski, 1988; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989; Rahim, 1988; Shaffer, Percy & Tepper, 1997; Swasy, 1979; Yukl & Falbe, 1991). A great deal of research has been done in connection with French and Raven's power bases (Nesler, et. al., 1999) in a variety of disciplines, including psychology (Nesler, Aguinis, Quigley, & Tedeschi, 1993), management (Yukl, 1994), and social work (Feld, 1987). Primarily the scales based on this taxonomy have been used in research measuring the perceived power of those in a supervisory status. For example, in management, one study found that employees who perceived their supervisors as having a good deal of expert and referent power were more satisfied with their supervision (Rahim, 1989). Other studies have found relationships between power bases and job performance, stress, and dedication to an organization (Carson, Carson, & Roe, 1993; Rahim & Afza, 1993; Sheridan & Vredenburgh, 1978). However, little research using such scales has been done in the area of education. Only one study to date has applied this power taxonomy to faculty-student relationships (Aguinis, Nesler, Quigley, Lee, & Tedeschi, 1996). In a sample of 346 graduate students, perceptions of faculty as having high referent, expert, and reward power were related to more positive faculty-student relationships, while greater perceptions of coercive power were related to more negative relationships. Likewise, professors rated with high referent and expert power were also rated as being more credible than those with high coercive power. Further students' ratings of a professor as having high coercive power and high

legitimate power were related to lower trustworthiness ratings of that professor. Finally, compliance with faculty requests were related to reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, and referent power (Aguinis, et. al., 1996). This study provided preliminary evidence suggesting that students' perceived power of a faculty member may influence their behavior with that individual and that different types of power can be either positive or negative influences on students' education. As already mentioned, there is no current literature relating French and Raven's (1959) power taxonomy to sexual harassment, despite the widely accepted notion that harassment is greatly intertwined with power.

Culture and power. Power differentials are evident not only between faculty and students or men and women, but also in the inequalities that exist when comparing Caucasians with people of color. Caucasian men dominate American culture through power bases of both money and position (Quina & Carlson, 1989). They also hold the majority of powerful roles in government, business, and academia. Stockdale (1996) suggested that these power and status differentials may cause minority individuals to be at greater risk for sexual harassment. Barak (1997) further noted that among women of color, there is a notion of inferiority, not only to men in general, but also to Caucasians. Because of racial stereotypes and power differences, minorities are often patronized and degraded in our society, suggesting that minorities are overpowered by the Caucasian majority (Barak, 1997). One need only look at the recent dragging death of an African American man in Jasper, Texas, to see that these dynamics still exist, even in greatly grotesque forms (Graczyk, 1998). Murrell (1996) stated that these power differentials

cause women of color to be more vulnerable to sexual harassment. Nevertheless, previously used harassment models fail to consider the interplay of gender and race structures in the creation of power dynamics in academia and the workplace (Rospenda, Richman, & Nawyn, 1998).

Not only do these power differentials exist between ethnic groups, they are also present within ethnic groups themselves. In Hispanic cultures, for example, clearly established hierarchical structures support patriarchal roles of authority in which men are encouraged to explore their sexuality, while women are closely guarded (Pavich, 1986). Further, Hispanic men are perceived as having greater authority in the culture thereby increasing power differentials between Hispanic women and men (Pavich, 1986; Sue & Sue, 1999). These structures further place Mexican American women at risk, as they appear to be doubly disadvantaged, once on the basis of gender and once on the basis of ethnicity.

Level of acculturation may thereby become a factor that influences how much Mexican American women experience harassment as well as how they respond to such harassment. More acculturated women may be considered more powerful than less acculturated women, who may be deemed disadvantaged because of less language ability and greater attachment to traditional views of the roles of men and women. Sue and Sue (1999) pointed out that as Hispanic women become more acculturated, traditional views may be questioned, thereby elevating acculturated women to greater levels of power. For example, one study found that more acculturated Hispanic American wives perceived themselves as equal partners with their spouses in making decisions (O'Guinn, Imperia,

& MacAdams, 1987). Further, more acculturated Hispanic women were less likely to hold traditional gender roles than less acculturated women (Kranau, Green, & Valencia-Weber, 1982). Other research has also supported this positive association between acculturation and beliefs in egalitarian gender roles and behaviors (Leaper & Valin, 1996; Taylor, Tucker, & Mitchell-Kernan, 1999).

In conclusion, the majority of the power literature regarding sexual harassment is theoretical in nature. Additionally, since most empirical studies of sexual harassment are atheoretical, little empirical support has been provided for the theoretical explanations of sexual harassment, including the power model (Legnick-Hall, 1995). This further supports the need to include power as a variable, particularly when studying ethnic and racial experiences of sexual harassment.

Sex-Role Spillover Theory

While power models of harassment are widely endorsed by harassment researchers, another theory is frequently cited to explain the existence of harassment in society: sex-role spillover theory (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Sex-role spillover theory states that harassment occurs because of cultural and social norms regarding sex roles which spill over into the workplace, thereby leading to sexual harassment (Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Stockdale, 1996).

Sex-role spillover is especially evident when the ratio of men-to-women in a particular work setting is highly skewed (Gutek & Done, 2001). Hence, women in fields that are non-traditional workplaces for women (e.g., engineering, construction, technology) are viewed as breaking societal norms and are hypothesized to experience

greater harassment (Paludi, 1996). This particular hypothesis has received support in studies which have found that women in non-traditional areas experience higher rates of harassment (e.g., Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Curiously, however, harassment may also occur when women are in positions reflective of traditional gender roles. Women in traditionally "feminine" occupations, such as waitress or receptionist, may experience harassment because their positions have been associated with sexual objectification or conventionally "feminine" qualities. According to this theory, women in both sets of occupations are hypothesized to experience greater harassment than women in workplaces displaying more equal representation of the sexes.

This study is based in both power theories of harassment and sex-role spillover theories, as both models lend support to explanations of why harassment may be greater for women of color. Because power differentials appear to be greatest for ethnic minority women, harassment is deemed to be more prevalent for Mexican American women than for Caucasian women. Further, a stronger endorsement of traditional sex roles by the Hispanic culture may exacerbate the problem, especially for less acculturated Mexican American women. Hence, power and culture seem to be intertwining influences in the experience of sexual harassment for Mexican American women.

Components of Sexual Harassment

Several components of sexual harassment are explored in the following section: prevalence rates of harassment, responses to sexual harassment, tolerance of sexual harassment, and self-reported negative consequences of harassment. Each section

discusses particular cultural variables that may impact each component in a unique way for Mexican American females on university campuses.

Sexual Harassment Definition and Prevalence

Before discussing the high prevalence of sexual harassment for women in the United States, one must first address the problem of defining sexual harassment. A variety of harassment definitions exist causing tremendous variance in prevalence rates to be reported in the literature. Thus, definitions of harassment are examined before addressing harassment prevalence statistics.

The ambiguity problem: Just what is sexual harassment? The definition of the term "sexual harassment" is ambiguous, to say the least. Even empirical researchers of the phenomenon employ a variety of meanings for the term (Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989). Two formal definitions exist in the literature: legal definitions and empirical definitions (Fitzgerald, 1990). Legal definitions, such as those used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) or the Office for Civil Rights, are more theoretical in nature and provide a general description of harassment behavior (Paludi & Barickman, 1991). As with other legal definitions, the legal criteria necessary to meet the definition of sexual harassment is in constant flux due to changes occurring through case law, appellate decisions, and regulatory definitions (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995). Currently the EEOC provides two legal categories for sexual harassment: quid pro quo harassment and hostile environment harassment. In quid pro quo harassment, the harasser either offers some benefit for a sexual favor or promises a removal of a threat of some type of harm (Thacker & Gohmann, 1996). In contrast,

hostile environment includes any behavior of a sexual nature, which can include such behavior as sexual joking, that is both unwelcome and occurs on numerous occasions (Thacker & Gohmann, 1996).

In contrast, empirical definitions have been formed from the categorization of qualitative data provided by harassment victims. They are descriptions of specific forms of behavior that have the potential of meeting legal criteria, given particular contextual factors (Fitzgerald, 1990; Fitzgerald et. al., 1995). The most comprehensive empirical definition of sexual harassment to date is the work of Till (1980). Before any legal definitions of harassment had been created, Till (1980) categorized the self-reported experiences of harassment victims into five different categories, which ranged in level of severity: gender harassment, seductive behavior, sexual bribery, sexual coercion, and sexual imposition. The least severe form of harassment is gender harassment, which includes verbal remarks such as coarse joking, sexist remarks, subjective objectification, sexual posturing, or sexual materials. Seductive behavior refers to verbal requests such as sexual advances, subtle pressure, advances, or sexual touching. Sexual bribery encompasses sexual advances with some kind of promise of reward, whereas sexual coercion incorporates sexual advances with a threat of punishment. Ultimately, sexual imposition is the most severe form of harassment, comprising sexual assault or touching (Till, 1980).

The most widely used research instrument in measuring sexual harassment, the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, was created based on Till's taxonomy (Fitzgerald, Shullman, Bailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988). A recent

revision of the scale (Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995) narrowed the harassment categories from five to three dimensions in response to research that indicated problems with the five dimensional structure. These three dimensions are gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. In this structure, the definition of gender harassment remained the same as that defined be Till (1980); however, unwanted sexual attention includes a range of verbal and nonverbal sexual behavior considered to be offensive and unwanted. Sexual coercion collapses the areas of sexual bribery and sexual coercion. Using this framework, EEOC's definitions of hostile environment would consist of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, or both, while quid pro quo harassment would be consistent with definitions of sexual coercion. Thus, the latest SEQ serves the purpose of intertwining definitions of harassment based both on legal and empirical standards.

Finally, an informal definition of sexual harassment is often used in research. Some studies simply asked participants whether or not they had been harassed without obtaining a behavioral description of the harassment itself. Thus, these studies used a simple yes/no definition of sexual harassment, which was entirely subjective in nature.

Problems abound with the use of any of these three definitions in researching sexual harassment. When using legal definitions, one must note that determinations of behavior as legal harassment requires a great deal of contextual information, including seriousness of the behavior as well as welcomeness of the behavior (Fitzgerald et. al., 1995). Further, because of the continual change in legal definitions, due especially to ever changing case law and because the courts may vacillate in labeling behavior as

harassment from case to case, it is extremely difficult to create measures which can be used to ascertain whether or not a particular behavior is actually harassment in a legal context. Alternately, use of empirical definitions, such as those used in the SEQ, can also be troublesome. While the revised SEQ accounts for behaviors that may be deemed harassment in a legal context, it cannot ascertain the contextual factors which must be argued to define such behavior as harassment in legal terms (Fitzgerald et. al., 1995). Most problematic are informal yes/no definitions of harassment. Many women who have experienced one of the behaviors outlined by Till do not actually label such behavior harassment (Magley et. al., 1999). Hence, using this type of definition facilitates what appears to be an enormous amount of underreporting of the actual harassment that veritably occurs.

In the present study, the empirical definition of sexual harassment as given by Till (1980) and as measured by the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1988) is used because of its empirical support, psychometrical soundness, and wide use in the psychological literature. Because such models cannot establish whether or not a single instance of offensive behavior can be classified as sexual harassment (Fitzgerald et. al., 1995), the term "sexually harassing behavior" will be used in this study rather then sexual harassment, in order to distinguish between the psychological construct of sexual harassment and its legal definition.

Harassment statistics. The ambiguity of the term "sexual harassment" has caused a wide variance in reporting rates of sexual harassment in the literature. In a review of the last two decades of sexual harassment research, Bowes-Sperry and Tata (1999) found

studies which separately reported a range of 28% to 90% of all women experiencing some form of sexual harassment. Bowes-Sperry and Tata (1999) attributed this to the multi-faceted definitions that are used in sexual harassment research. Thus, lowest rates of harassment appeared to be reported by researchers using an individual's self-report of harassment, medium levels of harassment rates were reported in studies using legal definitions, and the highest level of harassment were revealed in studies using empirical definitions. Because of this problem, more researchers are realizing the need for using widely accepted empirical measures, such as the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et. al., 1988). Using this definition, an early 1988 survey of 903 university students found that over one-half of all the women had experienced harassment (Fitzgerald et. al., 1988). The most frequently reported harassment types for these university women included gender harassment and seductive behavior.

Most studies on university campuses indicate a sexual harassment rate of approximately 20-30% for undergraduate women and 30-40% for graduate women for incidents involving faculty, staff, or administrators as the harasser, while peer to peer harassment statistics range from 70-90% (Sandler & Shoop, 1997; Shrier, 1996). Higher rates of sexual harassment appeared to occur between peers, who were either less likely to reap punishment for their behavior or were able to rationalize the behavior as simple flirting. An increased rate in harassment of graduate women has been universally noted and may be explained by the closing age gap between faculty and students as well as close mentoring relationships, making graduate students more vulnerable to sexual harassment (Project on the Status and Education of Women (PSEW), 1986). Graduate

students may also be at greater risk because they are highly dependent upon faculty for assistance with matters which ultimately advance their careers, such as publications, job opportunities, letters of recommendation, and dissertation approval. Thus, differing positions of power become more evident within the faculty-graduate student relationship, placing graduate students at increased risk for experiencing harassment.

Prevalence of harassment of minorities. Statistics on the prevalence of sexual harassment among minorities are difficult to locate. DeFour (1996) reported that most researchers have failed to include racial and ethnic demographic information when studying sexual harassment. Thus, amidst the scant research conducted, findings are limited, as well as contradictory. While some studies suggested that women of color may experience greater rates of sexual harassment due to power, cultural, and economic differentials (Gruber & Bjorn, 1986; Murrell, 1996; Segura, 1992), other large-scale studies have reported no differences between minority and majority groups for rates of sexual harassment (American Association of University Women (AAUW), 1993; Gutek, 1985; Niebuhr & Boyles, 1991; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB), 1987; USMSPB, 1988). Additionally, a few studies have exclusively studied people of color without comparing their data to Caucasians. For example, in a survey and interview of 152 Hispanic women in white-collar positions, Segura (1992) found that 33% of these women had experienced sexual harassment. Mecca and Rubin (1999) found that 52% of African-American university students had experienced some form of sexual harassment as measured on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaires. Perhaps these discrepancies may be explained partially by the fact that most large-scale studies did not use empirical

definitions of sexual harassment. Instead, they relied either upon simple yes/no subjective definitions or a few questions regarding harassment that range in severity rather than using the more empirically based questionnaires, which identify specific sexually harassing behaviors. Thus, women of color may have underreported harassment in these studies simply because the questions did not specifically address the type of harassment behavior they experienced, or they did not label the offensive behavior as harassment because they held a different definition of sexual harassment that was intertwined with the concept of racism.

As in the general literature, the ambiguous definition of sexual harassment raises particular concerns in cultural studies of sexual harassment. For example, Donovan and Drasgow (1997) analyzed responses to the SEQ by American, Brazilian, and Italian samples. Using differential item functioning, they found that those items measuring very specific harassment behaviors (e.g., "was staring or leering at you") functioned differently across cultures, while those which were broader in nature (e.g., "implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative) functioned similarly across the samples. Thus, it appears that specific behaviors of harassment may vary across cultures. For example, Collins (1990) found that women of color rarely thought sexual harassment was based solely on sex. Murrell (1996) explained that definitions of sexual harassment may differ in other populations, where racism may be intertwined with sexual harassment, creating a concept referred to as "sexual racism." Murrell (1996) suggested that because women of color have been sexually exploited throughout history, much of what is considered sexual harassment could actually be labeled sexual racism. These differences

in definition may also be found cross-culturally. A cross-cultural study of sexual harassment in the United States, Germany, Brazil, and Australia found considerable differences in the definitions of sexual harassment in these countries (Pryor, Desouza, Fitness, Hutz, Kumpf, Lubbert, Personen, & Erber, 1997). Brazilians typically viewed much sexual harassment to be harmless sexual behavior that was deemed inoffensive. Desouza and Hutz (1996) hypothesized that these differences exist because Brazil, where images of sexuality are seen as a part of daily living, is a country where erotic images are accepted as normative in comparison to the United States.

Pavich (1986) stated that the Hispanic culture differs significantly from the non-Hispanic in beliefs, attitudes, and norms regarding sexual behavior, which may also have implication for sexual harassment definitions. Norms of sexual silence govern Hispanic cultures, where women are expected to be passive, in addition to overlooking the "macho" behavior of men in their society (Oaks & Landrum-Brown, 1997). Hispanic women may view sexually harassing behaviors as part of a societal norm, thereby making it unlikely that they would label such behaviors harassment, even if they did report experiencing the behavior. Thus, definitions of sexual harassment may be quite different in Hispanic cultures, causing underreporting of sexual harassment according to United States definitions. This problem, in combination with the scarcity of sexual harassment literature involving race and ethnicity, indicates the need for further harassment research to obtain accurate prevalence statistics for people of color.

In addition to definitional problems that may affect prevalence statistics, power differentials may also cause women of color to be less likely to report harassment and be

at risk for harassment. Power differentials appear to be significant for minorities, who are more likely to attribute greater power to the harasser. In accordance with power models of harassment, this attribution may cause them to fear retaliation from the harasser, which may result in their desire to remain silent about the offending behavior. Cultural norms regarding sexuality, including norms of sexual silence, might exacerbate this problem. Likewise, economic differentials may cause women of color to stay in positions where they are victimized because they are in financial need, unlike other women who may have the option of leaving a position because of better financial opportunities.

DeFour (1996) hypothesized that racial stereotypes, cultural marginality, and the smaller number of minority individuals places them at higher risk for sexual harassment. Racial stereotypes, including the idea that Hispanic women are more sexual, "easy," and submissive, may lead to being targeted by harassers (Segura, 1992). Cultural marginality and smaller numbers of minority women may cause women of color to be particularly vulnerable because they are more isolated and feel less powerful in systems ruled by patriarchy. For example, in a study of autoworkers, Gruber and Bjorn (1986) found that African American women experienced higher rates and more severe forms of sexual harassment than Caucasian women. Likewise, in a study of 1037 university students, African Americans and Hispanics were found to experience the greatest frequency of harassment on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, followed by Caucasians and Asian Americans. This study determined that harassment rates varied as a function of race/ethnicity. (Cortina, Swan, Fitzgerald, & Waldo, 1998). Thus, ambiguous definitions

of harassment, power differentials, cultural norms, racial stereotypes, and minority status intertwine together to affect sexual harassment prevalence among women of color.

Responses to Sexual Harassment

A variety of responses to sexual harassment have been noted in the literature and are explored in the following section.

Categories of responses. Responses to sexual harassment can be categorized in a variety of ways. Fitzgerald, Swan, and Fischer (1995) identified two types of responses to sexual harassment: internal and external responses. Internal responses involve a cognitive or emotional reappraisal of an event as non-harassing. Examples of internally focused strategies include denial of the harassment, detachment from the situation, endurance, reattributions of events (e.g., attributing a non-harassing label to a harassing behavior for some reason, such as "he didn't mean to touch my breast; the spaces between the desks are just so tiny he couldn't help it"), and the belief that one has control in a situation that is inherently outside of his/her control (i.e., illusory control). According to Fitzgerald et. al. (1995), endurance can be described as ignoring the harassment or doing nothing. Denial would be described as pretending that the behavior is not occurring or that it has no effect. External responses to sexual harassment are behavioral strategies used to address the sexually harassing event. Examples of these responses include avoidance of the harasser, attempts to confront the harasser, appeasement, seeking of institutional relief, and seeking social support. Appeasement, as defined by Fitzgerald, et. al. (1995), is the attempt to put off the harasser's behavior without directly confronting

him or her. These attempts often include either humor or making excuses for the harasser's behavior.

In a review of the sexual harassment literature, Cochran, Frazier, and Olson (1997) have identified five overall categories or responses to sexual harassment: 1) ignoring, 2) avoidance, 3) telling someone, 4) confronting, and 5) reporting. By combining these categories, it appears that both ignoring and avoidance would be considered internally focused strategies, while telling someone, confronting the harasser, and reporting the behavior would be considered externally focused strategies. In their study of 4011 female and male undergraduate students, Cochran et. al. (1997) found that of those students who had experienced harassment, 60% ignored the behavior, 45% avoided the harasser, 45% talked to someone about the harassment, 25% indicated they confronted the harasser, and only 2% of students reported the harassment. Harassment in this study was measured by individuals reporting "yes" or "no" to seven questions regarding sexually harassing behaviors, including the following: unwanted teasing, jokes, comments, or questions related to sexual information; unwanted sexually suggestive leering or gesturing; unwanted letters or calls that were sexual in nature; unwanted pressure to date; unwanted pressure for sexual acts; unwanted touching; and attempted or actual assault.

These findings support prior research that has found the most commonly chosen response is to ignore the harassment (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Cammaert, 1985). Individuals may select this response because they do not wish to admit to themselves that anyone would treat them in such a fashion, or they may not have experienced the

harassing behavior as especially troublesome. Furthermore, they may prefer to ignore the behavior because the offender is in a position of authority, and they fear retaliation were they to take more direct measures to stop the harassment. Individuals may also fear other possibilities such as humiliation, shame, or not being believed by others. They may likewise convince themselves that it is "not that bad" and that it will go away on its own. Also common is the avoidance response, which, among university students, may include dropping a class, avoiding class, changing majors, changing advisors, or even dropping out of school (Adams et. al., 1983; Fitzgerald et. al., 1988). Avoidance may occur when individuals are fearful of repercussions (such as failing a class, estrangement by peers, rumors in the department, or a shift of blame from the actual harasser to the victim) were they actually to report. Confronting the harasser or reporting the harassment remain the least common responses to sexual harassment, with up to 3% of students making formal complaints in several studies (Adams et. al., 1983; Fitzgerald et. al., 1988; Reilly, Lott, & Gallogly, 1986). Reilly et. al.(1986) reported that telling a friend or family member was rare, possibly because individuals were embarrassed about the situation or feared the potential of peers turning on them if they were to share what happened.

Minority responses to sexual harassment. For women of color, little research has focused upon responses to sexual harassment (Murrell, 1996). While scant research is available, some literature suggests that culture may play an integral part in the way women of color respond to sexual harassment. For example, women of color may be more likely to distrust a justice system which has historically treated minority individuals unfairly, thereby making them less likely to report sexual harassment (Oaks & Landrum-

Brown, 1997). In a study of African-American and Caucasian female students, Shelton and Chavous (1999) found that African American women were more likely to rely upon support seeking behaviors as compared to Caucasians. Financial issues may also cause women of color to avoid and ignore sexual harassment (Stockdale, 1996), as Gutek (1985) reports that they are far less likely to quit their jobs because they cannot afford the loss of employment.

While no studies have been done on harassment of Mexican American women in academia, one could infer that they would also choose to avoid class or drop out of school in order to circumvent the harasser. Further, it may be suggested that Mexican American women are less likely to practice support-seeking behaviors because of the norm of sexual silence found in many Hispanic cultures (Lenhart, 1996; Marin & Gomez, 1996), where there is notable embarrassment surrounding issues of sexual content (Marin & Gomez, 1996). Because cultural norms emphasize the importance of female purity, Mexican American women who desire to share their sexual harassment experience may refrain from doing so for fear that their friends and family members will consider them dishonored and impure (Lenhart, 1996). Embarrassment combined with these codes of silence may discourage Mexican American women from seeking out social support, thereby causing them to turn to other methods of handling harassment, such as ignoring or avoiding behaviors. Mexican American women may also be less likely to report or confront faculty because of respect for those in authority (Pavich, 1986).

Tolerance of Sexual Harassment

Tolerance of sexual harassment addresses individual's attitudes towards the problem of sexual harassment in society. One's level of tolerance may affect numerous factors in the experience of harassment, including a decision of whether to label an offensive behavior as harassment, whether or not to report harassment, and reaction to being harassed.

Factors affecting harassment tolerance. A number of factors affect the level of tolerance of harassment, including, but not limited to gender, age, and type of environment. Some studies have confirmed that men exhibit a greater tolerance of harassment in comparison to women (Ford & Donis, 1996; Jones & Remland, 1992). Thus, behavior identified by women as sexually harassing is often not labeled as harassment by men, thereby creating gender discrepancies in harassment definitions. Age appears to interact with gender in its affect on tolerance. Women under 40 reported being less tolerant of sexual harassment than older women in contrast to men, whose tolerance decreased as their age increased (Ford & Donis, 1996). Finally, in environments which accept and model sexually harassing behaviors, higher tolerance scores for sexual harassment were noted (Pryor, 1985).

Culture and tolerance of sexual harassment. Although little research has been done on the tolerance of sexual harassment in Hispanic cultures, a number of cultural aspects may impact it. In many Hispanic cultures, males are rewarded for early sexual involvement, a high number of sexual partners, and extramarital affairs (Burgos & Perez, 1986). The machismo culture emphasizes the conquest of females by men, while shaming

this behavior in women. Men are encouraged to explore their sexuality, while young women are closely guarded by the family (Pavich, 1986). Because men are deemed to have difficulty controlling their sexual drives, they are not denigrated for these sexual infidelities (Marin & Gomez, 1996). Hispanic women, on the other hand, are encouraged to express femininity through passivity and purity (Oaks & Landrum-Brown, 1997). Norms of passivity may cause Hispanic women to choose to tolerate harassing behavior rather than speaking out against it. Further, females are expected to endure male sexual carousing and to sacrifice for the sake of the family (Oaks & Landrum-Brown, 1997). Since men are granted extra sexual freedoms, which women are to tolerate, macho behaviors such as catcalling, coarse joking, and fondling may be perceived by women as part of societal norms. If this is the case, Mexican American women may indeed be more tolerant of sexual harassment than Caucasian women. This greater tolerance of sexual harassment may lead Mexican American individuals to be less likely to identify offensive behaviors as harassment and may impact their chosen responses to harassment.

Negative Consequences of Sexual Harassment

It is important to note that regardless of whether or not individuals label their experiences as sexual harassment, they nevertheless experience psychological, professional, and health consequences (Magley, et. al., 1999). Even harassment experiences on the moderate end of the continuum (e.g., gender harassment) can lead to negative outcomes (Magley, et. al., 1999). More severe forms of sexual harassment result in far greater psychological and physiological consequences, as well as school-related problems (Thacker & Gohmann, 1996). Likewise, similar effects of increased

symptomatology severity are evident in victims who experience harassment for extended time periods (Thacker & Gohmann, 1996). The following section addresses such consequences for women who experience sexual harassment.

Psychological symptoms. Women who are harassed often report decreased psychological well-being and life satisfaction. In a study of 1178 employees at a utility organization, large university, and a plant location, Magley et. al. (1999) had participants complete a variety of measures including the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, Mental Health Index, Satisfaction with Life Scale, Crime Related Post Traumatic Stress Scale, Health Conditions Index, and the Retirement Descriptive Index. On the basis of their responses, participants were divided into two groups: those who on the SEQ labeled the behavior they experienced as harassment and those who did not. They further classified participants into four categories of low, moderate, and high frequency of harassment and no experience of harassment. By using discriminant function analysis, Magley et. al. (1999) found that they could differentiate between the different categories of individuals based upon level of reported distress on the psychological measures. Those reporting more harassment reported greater PTSD symptomatology and psychological distress, as well as less psychological well-being and life satisfaction. Another study reported similar findings. Using Structural Equation Modeling on a 2-year longitudinal sample of 217 employees, Glomb, Munson, Hulin, Bergman and Drasgow (1999) found that sexual harassment victims reported decreased life satisfaction, lower psychological well-being, and increased levels of stress as measured by the Satisfaction with Life Scale, Symptom Check List, and Mental Health Index (Glomb et. al., 1999).

Sexual harassment is often connected with the victim's plummeting self-esteem, which may result from a combination of feeling powerless to stop the harasser as well as being devalued as an individual (Gruber & Bjorn, 1986). Like women who have been sexually assaulted, sexual harassment victims frequently experience the following symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD): feelings of helplessness, avoidance of stimuli associated with the traumatic event, numbing of responsiveness, terror, and an increase in stimuli sensitivity (Rabinowitz, 1990). PTSD symptoms may surface as harassment becomes more severe and traumatic (e.g., sexual coercion and assault). Tong (1984) first coined the term the "Sexual Harassment Trauma Syndrome" to characterize the experience of sexually harassed clients, who reported a range of symptoms of anxiety, including shortness of breath, rapid pulse, fear, and/or panic symptoms (Holgate, 1989). Anxiety may arise when victims find themselves in unstable and unsafe environments in which they do not know when the harasser will next offend or whether or not they may lose their jobs should they choose to report. A constant sense of insecurity pervades an environment which condones sexual harassment.

In addition to suffering posttraumatic stress symptomatology, harassment victims often display symptoms typical of depression (Hamilton, Alagna, King, & Lloyd, 1987). Depression may occur when victims feel trapped in a situation which they feel incapable of changing. They begin to report feelings of helplessness and worthlessness, fatigue, and isolation. Harassed individuals also feel shame, irritability, alienation, humiliation, and vulnerability (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997). Shame and humiliation surface from the actual behaviors they endure (e.g., her peers leaving sexually explicit material on her

desk, her boss fondling her publicly, her sexuality being mocked, etc.). Harassment victims may become irritable because they realize that the behavior should not be occurring, yet since it is being permitted, they suspect that the organization is unwilling to do anything about it. Finally, Lenhart (1996) stated that sexual harassment victims are more likely to be diagnosed with mood and/or sleep disorders, sexual dysfunction, and substance abuse.

Academic consequences. Psychological symptoms are not the only consequences of harassment. Related are the negative repercussions that affect the learning environment. Sexually harassed women report lower motivation, impaired relationships, and lower self-confidence (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997). Additionally, students may drop a class, change majors, change advisors, or drop out of school to avoid the harasser (Adams et. al., 1983; Fitzgerald et. al., 1988). Because the victims of certain kinds of harassing behaviors have a constant fear that the perpetrator will offend again, school behavior and attitudes are decidedly affected. Anxiety may produce difficulties with concentration, elevated stress levels, and increased absenteeism (Adams-Ray & Barling, 1998). Trapped in indecision, students rehearse inwardly the risks of keeping silent versus the risks of reporting. If they remain silent, prolonged harassment, which usually increases in severity, may occur (Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, & Stringer, 1986). Yet, if they report, there may be reprisal, a loss of peer support, and academic consequences, such as lost letters of recommendation, future job opportunities, or high grades (Salisbury, et. al., 1986). Reporting may seem like an impossible option since authority positions in university settings are still held predominantly by males, who are more likely

to overlook minor offenses of sexual harassment (Dziech & Weiner, 1990; Ford & Donis, 1996; Jones & Remland, 1992).

Physical symptomatology. Physical symptoms are an additional negative consequence of sexual harassment. What is not expressed emotionally, the body begins to express physically. Numerous health effects have been correlated with sexual harassment: headaches, fatigue, stomach problems, nausea, sleep disturbances, weight loss or gain, and back pain (O'Donohue, 1997; Salisbury et. al, 1986). Further, sexual harassment victims report appetite disturbances, anergia, shortness of breath, and rapid pulse rate (Gutek, 1985; Holgate, 1989). Combined with external stressors, these factors cause victims to become more vulnerable to infectious disease and various stress-related illnesses.

Consequences for women of color. As with other areas of sexual harassment, little research can be found on the specific physical, academic, and psychological consequences of sexual harassment for women of color (Murrell, 1996). However, in a study of adolescent girls, African-Americans were found to be more negatively impacted by sexual harassment than Caucasians, as they reported greater negative emotional and educational consequences (AAUW, 1993). Some of these consequences included not wanting to attend school, concentration problems, not talking as much in the classroom, embarrassment, self-consciousness, and lowered self confidence. Perhaps the intertwining of gender and minority statuses causes minority women to experience greater stress than non-minority women because they are "doubly disadvantaged."

In addition to stress caused by being in two minority roles, Mexican American women may experience greater psychological consequences because of stereotypes demanding purity. Due to cultural demands for chastity, Hispanic women may exhibit increased shame, depression, and guilt when they are sexually harassed. This, in combination with norms of "sexual silence," may cause them to be even less likely to seek support from others. With lack of support from others, symptoms may increase, resulting in more negative consequences for Mexican American women than for Caucasians.

Dissertation Study

Specifically, this study provides prevalence statistics regarding sexual harassment among both Caucasian and Mexican American female populations on university campuses. Further, it examines differences between Mexican American and Caucasian female students' responses to harassment, perceptions of harasser's power, and tolerance of sexual harassment. Finally, negative consequences of sexually harassing behaviors are examined in both Mexican American and Caucasian students. By investigating these variables, it is the author's hope that a clearer picture can emerge of how the intertwining of power and culture affects the prevalence of sexual harassment, tolerance of sexual harassment, responses to sexual harassment, and consequences of harassment in university settings.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used in this study, including a description of the sample, procedures, and instruments. At its conclusion, research questions and hypotheses are addressed.

Procedures

Permission to conduct the studies was sought and received from the University of Texas Institutional Review Board, University of Texas at Brownsville Institutional Review Board, and St. Mary's University Institutional Review Board. The ethical standards of the American Psychology Association, the University of Texas' "Policies and Procedures Governing Research with Human Subjects," University of Texas at Brownsville's ethical policies, and St. Mary's University ethical polices were followed to insure the ethical treatment of all participants and the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses.

After approval from the Institutional Boards of the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Texas at Brownsville, and St. Mary's University of San Antonio was received, approval to gain access to the Educational Psychology Subject Pool at the University of Texas at Austin was requested. Additionally, instructors from the psychology department of St. Mary's University and the education, psychology, and history departments of the University of Texas at Brownsville were contacted and permission was granted to recruit students in their classes for the study.

At the University of Texas at Austin, female participants were randomly selected from introductory Educational Psychology classes and assigned to this study. Participants were offered a variety of one-hour time slots to complete the study. At each time period, a research assistant distributed to participants a consent form which emphasized the confidentiality of responses and that participation in the study was entirely voluntary (see Appendix A). The consent form also included a brief explanation of the study. Participants received the questionnaires and were given the following instructions, "Please fill out the following surveys. Know that your responses are strictly confidential. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We are simply interested in how you view things." All participants chose to stay and participate in the study. Each participant received the following: a demographic information page, including items regarding age, ethnicity, and year in school; two sexual harassment surveys; a set of questions regarding responses to harassment; a survey measuring perceived power of the harasser; a survey measuring harassment tolerance; various scales measuring psychological and physical symptomatology; and an acculturation scale. Students who indicated they had never experienced any offensive behaviors were instructed to not fill out the set of response questions, the power survey, or the scale measuring PTSD symptomatology, since these questions were only for individuals who had experienced offensive behavior.

At the University of Texas at Brownsville, permission was granted to allow the researcher to come in during class time to distribute the packet of surveys and monitor the filling out of these surveys. Eighteen classes were visited at the University of Texas at

Brownsville. The above procedures for the University of Texas at Austin were also used at this university. Three participants chose not to participate after informed consent information was distributed.

At St. Mary's University, professors preferred to distribute the surveys themselves. Fifteen professors, offering extra credit, approached classes regarding participation in the study. Procedures were explained to the professors in written form, and they then monitored the completion of the surveys. Since the researcher did not monitor the completion of these surveys personally, they were distributed in envelopes to protect anonymity and confidentiality of all participants who were asked to return the surveys in the sealed envelope. Eleven surveys were returned blank, indicating the individuals' desire not to participate. Some professors reported that time ran out during class, and they allowed students to complete the surveys outside of class and return them in the sealed envelope at the next class period.

Participants

In order to gain access to Mexican American students of varying acculturation levels, data were gathered from 399 participants from three Texas universities: St. Mary's University in San Antonio, the University of Texas at Brownsville, and the University of Texas at Austin. Each of these cities lies progressively further away from the Texas-Mexico border with Austin being the most distant and Brownsville being the closest. More participants from Brownsville, a border town, reported being first-generation Americans than those in either San Antonio or Austin, thereby leading to varying acculturation levels across the three universities.

At St. Mary's university, students enrolled in a subset of upper and lower division psychology classes were offered extra credit by their instructor for their participation. At the University of Texas at Brownsville, students were recruited through the psychology, education, and history departments in a subset of classes of professors who agreed to participate. At the University of Texas at Austin, a subject pool from the Educational Psychology department was used for data collection, which included only female students, as requested by the researcher. The total female sample of 399 students included: St. Mary's University (32.1%, n = 128), the University of Texas at Brownsville (33.1%, n = 132), and the University of Texas at Austin (34.8%, n = 139). (At St. Mary's University and the University of Texas at Brownsville, male students also completed measures and received extra credit for class participation, but their data was not included in this study).

Of the 399 participants in the study, twenty-seven participants were eliminated from the sample because they did not list themselves as Caucasian or Mexican American. Their ethnic breakdown included: African Americans (n = 7), Asian Americans (n = 2), Other Hispanics (n = 13), and Other (n = 5). Hispanics not listing themselves as Mexican American were excluded from the study because the acculturation measure used is specifically for individuals who self-identify as Mexican American.

Demographic Information

Participants completed a demographics form requesting the following information: sex, age, race/ethnicity, birthplace of participant and participant's family members, languages spoken at home, family income, university attended, and year in

school (see Appendix B). Demographic details for study participants can be found in Table 1. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 52 with a mean age of 22.19 (*SD* = 5.41). A majority of the sample indicated they were Mexican American (70.2%, *n* = 261), while 29.8% indicated they were Caucasian (*n* = 111). Most students indicated they were born in the United States (94.6%, *n* = 349). A fairly normal distribution of family income level can be seen for the sample as a whole, with students being equally represented across income levels. However, the majority of Mexican American (50.8%) students reported lower family incomes, under $40,000, while the majority (56.1%) of Caucasians reported higher family incomes, over $80,000.

Table 1
Demographic Information on Study Participants

	Mexican American		Caucasian		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Year in School						
Freshman	56	21.5	17	15.5	73	19.7
Sophomore	63	24.2	16	14.5	79	21.4
Junior	59	22.7	25	22.7	84	22.7
Senior	58	22.3	45	40.9	103	27.8
Graduate	24	9.2	7	6.4	31	8.4
Birthplace						
USA	243	93.5	106	97.2	349	94.6
Mexico	17	6.5	0	0	17	4.6
Other	0	0	3	2.8	3	.8
Languages at Home						
English Only	41	15.9	102	92.7	143	38.9
Spanish Only	39	15.1	1	.9	40	10.9
Bilingual Home	178	69.0	5	4.5	183	49.7
Other Language	0	0	2	1.8	2	.5
Family Income						
< $20,000	65	26.8	1	1.0	67	19.1
$20,001-$40,000	59	24.0	11	10.5	70	18.8
$40,001-$60,000	35	14.2	13	12.4	48	13.7
$60,001-$80,000	34	13.8	21	20.0	55	15.7
$80,001-$100,000	29	11.8	18	17.1	47	13.4
>$100,000	23	9.3	41	39.0	64	18.2

Instruments

A summary of all measures used in the study appears in Table 2 (see Table 2). The following measures were administered to participants: Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, Form E (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, & Gelfand, 1993), Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Latina (Cortina, 2001), Social Power Scales (Swasy, 1979), Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (Mazer & Percival, 1989), a set of response questions based upon the methodology of Cochran, et. al., (1997), PTSD Symptom Scale: Self-Report Version (Foa, Riggs, Dancu, & Rothbaum, 1993), Beck Depression Inventory II (Beck, Steer, & Brown, 1996), and Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II) (Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995). The scales are presented in Appendices C-J in the order administered to research participants.

Table 2
Summary Table of Instruments

Instrument	Number of Items	Number of subscales	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)
SEQ	19	3	.88
Gender Harassment Subscale	7		.82
Unwanted Sexual Attention Subscale	5		.83
Sexual Coercion Subscale	7		.71
SEQ-Latina	20	3	.93
Sexist Hostility Subscale	4		.80
Sexual Hostility Subscale	4		.83
Unwanted Sexual Attention Subscale	12		.90
Social Power Scales	31	6	.97
Legitimate Power Subscale	5		.93
Coercive Power Subscale	5		.95
Expertise Power Subscale	8		.93
Referent Power Subscale	6		.94
Reward Power Subscale	4		.94
Information Power Subscale	3		.90
Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale	19	0	.84
Response Questions	3	0	None reported
PTSD Symptom Scale	17	0	.88
Beck Depression Inventory II	21	0	.92
ARSMA-II	47	5	.79-.94
Anglo Orientation Subscale	13		.79
Mexican Orientation Subscale	16		.94
Anglo Marginality Subscale	6		.91
Mexican Marginality Subscale	6		.90
Mexican American Marginality	6		.90

Note. SEQ and SEQ-L responses range from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Social Power from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). PTSD and BDI from 0 (not at all) to 3 (almost always). SHAS from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). ARSMA-II from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely often).

Measure of Sexual Harassment Frequency

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, Form E (SEQ) (Fitzgerald et. al., 1993) (see Appendix C). The SEQ was used to measure the frequency of sexually harassing behaviors experienced by both Mexican American and Caucasian students. The SEQ is a behavioral-based measure of sexual harassment whose purpose is to identify the frequency of sexual harassment. While the SEQ aids participants in indicating what sexually harassing behaviors they have experienced, it cannot indicate whether someone has experienced sexual harassment according to EEOC or legal definitions. The SEQ indicates whether a person has experienced offensive behavior which may be deemed sexual harassment by these definitions, meeting the empirical definitions of sexual harassment set out by Till (1980), which are widely accepted for research purposes.

All items ask the participant to respond whether or not a behavior occurred, thus avoiding the misinterpretation of the ambiguous term "sexual harassment." An example item is: "Have you ever been in a situation where any individuals gave you unwanted sexual attention ?" The term "sexual harassment" is not included in the survey until the last item, which asks, "Have you ever been sexually harassed?" Likert responses, ranging from 0 to 4, include: 1) never, 2) once, and 3) sometimes, 4) often, and 5) very often.

Fitzgerald (1990) claimed that the SEQ, which has been found to have good reliability and validity, is the only sexual harassment survey that meets standard psychometric criteria. In a sample of 1395 participants, Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the total scale score was found to be .92. Additionally, a stability coefficient of .86 was found over a 2-week period, and the average split half reliability was .75. In the current

sample, Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the total scale score was .88. The scale scores indicated good reliability for both Mexican American students and Caucasians students with separate coefficient alphas of .88 and .90, respectively. Content validity, of course, is already built into the instrument by being based upon Till's theoretical continuum of sexual harassment behavior (Beere, 1990). Fitzgerald et. al. (1988) state that rarely endorsed items can be dropped from the scale without diminishing the validity and reliability of the measure. Thus, this study used the shortened 19 item scale, Form E, which has a range of 0 to 76.

The SEQ, Form E (Fitzgerald, et. al., 1993), has three major subscales: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention would both fall under EEOC's definition of hostile environment sexual harassment, while sexual coercion would be considered quid pro quo harassment by EEOC definitions (Fitzgerald, et. al., 1995). Gender harassment (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9) is described as verbal or nonverbal behaviors which display degrading, hostile, or insulting attitudes but whose purpose is not to invoke sexual activity. Cronbach's alpha for the gender harassment scale scores was .82 (Fitzgerald, et. al., 1995) and in the current sample was found to be .82 as well. Unwanted sexual attention (items 5, 8, 10, 13, 14) is comprised of verbal and nonverbal behaviors which were originally in the three categories of seductive behavior and sexual imposition. Thus, behaviors such as repeated requests for dates, sexual touching or grabbing, or assault are placed in this category. The unwanted sexual attention subscale scores have a Cronbach's alpha of .85 (Fitzgerald, et. al., 1995) and in the current sample it was .83. Lastly, sexual coercion

(items 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19) includes items with either explicit or implied bribes or threats for sexual activity (Fitzgerald et. al., 1993). The Cronbach's alpha for the sexual coercion subscale scores was .42 (Fitzgerald, et. al., 1995) but in the current sample was .71. All three subscales are used as dependent variables in the study.

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Latina (SEQ-L) (Cortina, 2001) (See Appendix D). The SEQ-L is a scale measuring the sexual harassment in the Latina population and is based on the widely used Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. The need for such a scale is based in prior research, which has shown that specific behavioral expressions of sexual harassment vary culture to culture (Barak, 1997; Donovan & Drasgow, 1997). The SEQ-L consists of 20 items with three subcategories: sexist hostility (items 1, 2, 3, 4) sexual hostility (items 5, 6, 7, 8) and unwanted sexual attention (items 9-20). Both sexist and sexual hostility are considered to be gender harassment in accordance with the original SEQ scale. Sexist hostility refers to behaviors that degrade women or men but have no sexual content, while sexual hostility includes behaviors containing sexual content, such as crude jokes or comments. Unwanted sexual attention retains the same definition as is provided in the SEQ.

Participants respond to each item by using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0, never, to 4, very often. An example item from the scale is: "While at the university, have you ever been in a situation where any individuals made kissing noises or whistled at you?" Some items were slightly altered to make them appropriate for both male and female participants (e.g., changing women to "your sex"). The author reported high reliability for the scale scores, with Cronbach's alphas of .90 for the sexist hostility

subscale scores, .90 for the sexual hostility subscale scores, and .95 for the unwanted sexual attention subscale scores (Cortina, 2001). In the current sample, Cronbach's alpha for the total scale scores was .93. Good reliability of scores was obtained for both Mexican Americans and Caucasians with coefficient alphas on the total scale scores of .92 and .94, respectively. Cronbach's alphas for the subscale scores were as follows: sexist hostility - .80, sexual hostility - .83, and unwanted sexual attention - .90.

Since both the SEQ and SEQ-L were used together to measure prevalence of sexual harassment rates in both Mexican American and Caucasian students, correlational analyses were run to obtain the intercorrelation value of the total scale scores. As expected, the scores on the scales were found to be strongly correlated (r = .81).

Measure of Response to Sexually Harassing Behaviors

Response Questions (see Appendix E). To the author's knowledge, no published measure is available in the literature regarding responses to sexual harassment. The response questions were listed directly after the scales measuring the harassing behaviors students reported experiencing. In this section, students were asked to list which of the offensive behaviors was most upsetting from the SEQ and SEQ-L items, how long ago that behavior occurred, who performed the behavior (faculty, staff, student, or graduate student who is a teaching assistant or assistant instructor), and the ethnicity of the person who performed the behavior. Based upon the methodology of Cochran, et. al., (1997), students were asked, "How did you respond to the above behavior?" and were given the following options to check off: 1) ignored the behavior, 2) avoided the harasser, 3) told a friend or family member, 4) confronted the person, or 5) reported the behavior to

someone in authority. This was used to identify the methods employed to handle the most offensive behavior. The participants were also asked to respond to a set of qualitative questions regarding reporting behavior. These included the following: 1) "Put into your own words how you responded to the behavior," 2) "What was the main reason for your choice of response to the behavior, " 3) "If you chose not to report the behavior, what was your reason for doing so," 4) "If you did report the behavior, where did you report it," 5) "If you chose to later report a behavior, where would you go," and 6) "What factors played into your decision to not report the behavior?"

Measure of the Perceived Power of the Offender

Social Power Scales (Swasy, 1979) (See Appendix F). The Social Power Scales, which were created as a measure of perceived interpersonal power, were used to measure the student's perception of the amount of power the offender holds. The scales are based on French and Raven's (1959) theory of six types of perceived interpersonal power: reward power, coercive power, referent power, legitimate power, expert power, and informational power. Some questions have been slightly modified to be appropriate for university settings. This scale was completed after the participants had filled out the measures regarding offensive behaviors they had experienced. The following instructions were given for this scale: "Please answer the following questions about the person who offended you (referred to as "A" in the following items). In thinking about your relationship with this person, check the square which corresponds best with your thinking about the person."

The Social Power Scales consist of 31 Likert scale items with the response scale ranging from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. An example item from the scale is: "Something bad will happen to me if I don't do as A requests and A finds out." The Legitimate scale consists of three items and assesses an authority's right to dictate another's behavior, while the Coercive scale (5 items) measures power based on the belief that the other person can punish her for failure to comply with requests. The Expertise scale, consisting of 8 items, measures a person's assessment of another's knowledge. The Referent scale (6 items) assesses a person's desire to be like the other, while the Reward scale (4 items) measures a person's assessment of the other's ability to reward or punish them in some way. Finally, the Information scale (3 items) assesses the value a person places on the other's access to information and greater communication abilities. Individuals may have high power in some areas but not others, but the greater the basis of power in all areas, the greater the overall power.

Higher scores on the scales indicate a higher attribution of social power. Coefficient alphas for scores on each scale have been reported as: Legitimate scale = .59, Coercive scale = .84, Expertise scale=.86, Referent=.83, Reward=.82, and Information=.74 (Swasy, 1979). In the current sample, Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the scores on the scales were as follows: Total Scale=.97, Legitimate = .93, Coercive = .95, Expertise = .93, Referent = .94, Reward = .94, and Information = .90.

Measure of Tolerance of Sexual Harassment

Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (Mazer & Percival, 1989) (see Appendix H). The Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale, a 19-item Likert scale that assesses attitudes

towards harassment, was used to measure the amount of sexual harassment tolerance a student possesses. The Likert scale responses consists of a range from 1, strongly agree to 5, strongly disagree. The scale appears to be a reliable measure of attitudes towards harassment in college students, with one report of reliability of scores at .82 (Shelton & Chauvos, 1999). In Mazer & Percival (1989), the Coefficient alpha on the scores for the total scale was .84, indicating high internal consistency. In the current sample, Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the total scores was also .84. Items include such statements as: "Sexual harassment refers to those incidents of unwanted sexual attention that aren't too serious" and "Many charges of sexual harassment are silly and vengeful." Higher scores on the scale indicate greater tolerance of sexual harassment.

Measures of Psychological and Physical Consequences of Sexual Harassment

PTSD Symptom Scale: Self-Report Version (Foa, et. al.,, 1993) (see Appendix G). The PTSD Symptom Scale was used to assess the amount of post-traumatic stress symptomatology experienced by students who reported experiencing an offensive behavior. The following directions were given to students in order to assess the amount of distress that is related to the harassment experienced: "Below is a list of problems that people sometimes have after experiencing an upsetting event(s). Rate each problem with respect to the upsetting behavior you experienced. Read each one carefully and check the appropriate box that best describes how often that problem has bothered you IN THE PAST MONTH." Participants' responses ranged from "not at all" to "almost always." A sample item for the scale is: "Having upsetting thoughts or images about the offensive behavior that came into your head when you didn't want them to."

The PTSD Symptom Scale is a 17-item Likert scale that was normed on a sample of 120 sexual assault victims (Foa, et. al., 1993). The scale divides symptoms into the three clusters (re-experiencing, avoidance, and arousal) that correspond to the PTSD symptoms listed in the DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). The scale has been demonstrated to have acceptable levels of reliability and validity (Foa et al., 1993) and provides measures of the presence and the severity of PTSD symptoms. Scores range from 0 to 51, with higher scores indicative of greater PTSD symptomatology. In the original sample, Cronbach's alpha was .85 for the total scale scores. In the current sample, Cronbach's alpha for the total scores was .88. The scale showed good concurrent validity with the following scales: Beck Depression Inventory (r = .72), Impact of Event Scale which measures trauma-related effect (r = .69), Rape Aftermath Symptom Test (r = .67), and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (r = .48) (Foa et al., 1993).

The Beck Depression Inventory II (Beck, et. al., 1996) (see Appendix I). The Beck Depression Inventory II was used to assess the level of depression experienced by students. The Beck Depression Inventory II is a 21-item test that measures presence and degree of depression in adolescents or adults. Items are presented in blocks of four statements and participants must check the statement which best describes them. For example, one item, measuring degree of sadness, presents the following four statements: 1) I do not feel sad, 2) I feel sad, 3) I am sad all the time and I can't snap out of it, and 4) I am so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.

The inventory is one of the most widely used depression instruments and shows high reliability and validity (Beck, et. al., 1996). On an initial sample of 500 individuals,

the Coefficient alpha for total scale scores was .92. In the current sample, Cronbach's Coefficient alpha for the total scores was .92. Scores range from 0 to 63, with higher scores indicative of greater depression.

Measure of Acculturation

Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II) (Cuellar, et. al., 1995) (See Appendix J). The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II is an instrument measuring the acculturation of Mexican Americans. Responses range from 1, not at all, to 5, extremely often. Scale 1 of the instrument (items 1-29) yields two acculturation scores, integration and assimilation. Scale 1 has two subscales, the Anglo Orientation Subscale with 13 items, and the Mexican Orientation Subscale with 16 items. An example item from Scale 1 is, "I speak Spanish." Both subscales have shown good internal reliability with the scores on the Anglo Orientation Subscale demonstrating a Cronbach's Alpha of .86 and the scores on the Mexican Orientation Subscale revealing a Cronbach's Alpha of .88. In the present sample, the total scores on the Anglo Orientation Subscale yielded a coefficient alpha of .79, while the Mexican Orientation Subscale scores revealed an alpha of .94. Higher scores on the Anglo Orientation subscale indicate greater acculturation to the United States, while higher scores on the Mexican Orientation subscale indicate less acculturation.

The Marginality Scale, Scale 2 of the instrument (items 30-47), consists of three subscales: Anglo Marginality, Mexican Marginality, and Mexican American Marginality. Each of these subscales contains 6 items and measures one's difficulty accepting a culture or representations of a culture. An example item from Scale 2 is: "I have difficulty

accepting some values held by some Mexicans." Scores on The Marginality Scale indicate good overall reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .87. In the present sample, coefficient alphas were calculated on the scores for each of the subscales of Scale 2, yielding the following results: Anglo Marginality = .91; Mexican Marginality = .90; Mexican American Marginality = .90. Scores for each of the subscales can be calculated as well as an overall acculturation level which ranges from "very Mexican oriented" (Level 1) to "very assimilated; Anglicized" (Level 5). Higher scores on the Anglo Marginality subscale indicate less affiliation with the Anglo culture, while higher scores on the Mexican or Mexican American Marginality subscales indicate less affiliation with either the Mexican or Mexican American culture, respectively. Scores on each of the subscales were used in the analyses.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Sexual Harassment Prevalence

While prior research regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment in minority women has resulted in contradictory findings, multiple authors have suggested that women of color may experience greater rates of sexual harassment because of power differentials, racial stereotypes, and cultural marginality (DeFour, 1996; Gruber & Bjorn, 1986; Murrell, 1996; Segura, 1992;). Because power differentials are still present between minority and majority cultures (e.g., Caucasian men still hold the predominance of power in our governments, workplaces, and universities), women of color are more at risk of being harassed. Likewise, the stereotypes of Mexican American women as submissive may further increase their risk because harassers may deem them less likely

to report the behavior. Hence, it is proposed that Mexican American women will indicate that they have experienced more sexually harassing behaviors than Caucasian women. Further, because of the history of prejudice in our society, Hispanic women may actually tag offensive behavior as racism instead of labeling it sexual harassment (Murrell, 1996). Thus, while Mexican American students will admit that they have experienced behaviors which would be categorized as sexual harassment according to Till's model (1980), they will not actually label the behavior sexual harassment. In agreement with prior research, it is assumed that the majority of participants will report at least one sexually harassing behavior (Sandler & Shoop, 1997). Hence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1a. Mexican American students will report more sexually harassing behaviors than Caucasian students.

Hypothesis 1b. Mexican American students will be less likely than Caucasian students to label the offensive behaviors as harassment.

In addition, because no prior research has been done in the area, one research question has been proposed. Since marginalization might be greater for individuals who are less acculturated, they may experience more sexually harassing behaviors.

Research Question 1. How is acculturation related to amount of harassment experienced?

Responses to Sexual Harassing Behaviors

Because of norms of sexual silence in Hispanic culture, Hispanic women may be less likely to seek out the support of others when they experience sexual harassment (Marin & Gomez, 1996). So, out of shame and embarrassment, Mexican American

women may simply resort to avoidance and ignoring strategies. Likewise, because of strong patriarchal structures in Hispanic societies, Hispanic students may be less likely to report harassment out of a hesitancy or fear of disrespecting authority (Pavich, 1986). Further, Mexican American women may be fearful of confronting harassers because they are taught to be submissive to male authority. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

> *Hypothesis 2.* Mexican American students will report more indirect methods of responding (e.g., ignoring the behavior or avoiding the harasser) and fewer support-seeking strategies (e.g., talking to a friend or family member) or direct strategies (e.g., confronting the offender or reporting the offender) than Caucasian students.

Power of Offender

Hierarchical structures appear to be firmly entrenched in Hispanic cultures where patriarchal authority is in place (Pavich, 1986). Thus, Mexican American women will attribute greater power to men in general and specifically to men who offend them in comparison to Caucasian women. Likewise, racial stereotyping and racial discrimination may lead Hispanics to deem others as more powerful, particularly because the majority culture holds greater financial resources and more positions of authority in society (Barak, 1997; Quina & Carlson, 1989). It is thus plausible that Mexican American students will attribute more power to offenders than Caucasian students, especially when offenders are Caucasian. Because power differentials between men and women are ingrained in Hispanic cultures, Mexican American women will attribute more power to offenders than Caucasian women will, regardless of the offender's status on campus (e.g.,

faculty, staff, or student). However, power differentials will be most apparent in appraisal of faculty power. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 3a. Regardless of offender status, Mexican American students will perceive the offender as more powerful than Caucasian students will.

Hypothesis 3b. Regardless of offender status, Mexican American students will perceive Caucasian offenders as more powerful than minority offenders in comparison to Caucasian students.

Additionally, one research question is proposed regarding power of the offender. Individuals who are newer to a country or feel less identification with the culture or its values may feel more marginalized that those who are more acculturated. Because they may be less likely to know of resources available to them and because they may be more dependent on others for survival, they may perceive individuals of the dominant culture as more powerful. However, with little existing research in this area, this has been posed as a research question.

Research Question 2. How is acculturation related to perceptions of offender power?

Tolerance of Sexual Harassment

Many Hispanic cultures are more accepting of the sexual prowess of males, who are forgiven their sexual infidelities (Marin & Gomez, 1996; Burgos & Perez, 1986). Further, Hispanic women are expected to remain silent about issues of sexuality and to be passive and subordinate to men (Pavich, 1986; Oaks & Landrum-Brown, 1997). Thus, it appears that Mexican American women will be more tolerant of sexual harassment

because of cultural norms regarding sexuality. Hence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 4a. Mexican American students will report greater tolerance of sexually harassing behaviors than Caucasian students.

Hypothesis 4b. More acculturated Mexican American students will report less tolerance of sexually harassing behaviors than less acculturated students.

Consequences of Sexually Harassing Behaviors

Because strict rules of sexuality exist for Hispanic women, it is possible that sexual harassment may be even more detrimental because they may not feel free to seek support from others. Thus, they may experience compounded symptoms of depression and anxiety. Further, because of cultural norms that demand purity, Mexican American women may experience greater shame and guilt when they are sexually harassed. Additionally, the designation of two minority statuses in being both Mexican American and female may cause Mexican American women to have greater stress because they appear to be "doubly disadvantaged." However, because there has been little research in this area to support a hypothesis in one direction, the following has been phrased as a research question for this study:

Research Question 3. Mexican American students who report having experienced a sexually harassing behavior will report greater rates of negative symptomatology (including depression and PTSD symptomatology) when compared to Caucasian students, who report having experienced a sexually harassing behavior.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the dissertation study of Mexican American and Caucasian University students' experiences of sexual harassment. Findings are presented in order of hypotheses following the same pattern presented in chapter three: sexual harassment prevalence, responses to sexual harassment, power of the offender, sexual harassment tolerance, and consequences of sexually harassing behaviors. A descriptive summary of item means scores by ethnicity on all scales is provided in Appendix K. Additionally, a summary of harassing behaviors by school is provided in Appendix L.

Sexual Harassment Prevalence

The first goal of this dissertation was to explore the prevalence of sexual harassment between Mexican American and Caucasian university students. Overall, a majority of students (79.8%) reported experiencing at least one sexually harassing behavior while at their university, as indicated by their responses on the SEQ and SEQ-L combined, and 76.3% of all students reported experiencing more than one sexually harassing behavior. By ethnicity, 79.8% of Mexican American students and 76.4% of Caucasian students reported experiencing at least one sexually harassing behavior. Additionally, 75.7% of Mexican American students reported experiencing more than one sexually harassing behavior in comparison to 76.4% of Caucasian students. Prevalence of experiencing each type of harassment (never, once, or more than once) by ethnicity is

summarized in Table 3 (see Table 3). Frequency of harassing behaviors experienced by all participants on all SEQ and SEQ-L items is summarized in Appendix M.

Table 3

Participants' Experiences of Sexually Offensive Behaviors

	Mex Amer		Caucasian		Total	
Type of Offensive Behavior	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Harassment (SEQ)						
Never	75	29.8	31	29.8	106	29.8
Once	18	7.1	4	3.8	22	6.2
More than Once	159	63.1	69	66.3	228	64.0
Unwanted Sexual Attention (SEQ)						
Never	126	50.0	44	41.9	170	47.6
Once	17	6.7	8	7.6	25	7.0
More than Once	109	43.3	53	50.5	162	45.4
Sexual Coercion (SEQ)						
Never	216	83.7	92	85.2	308	84.2
Once	17	6.6	7	6.5	24	6.6
More than Once	25	9.7	9	8.3	34	9.3
Sexist Hostility(SEQ-L)						
Never	129	50.8	52	49.1	181	50.3
Once	16	6.3	6	5.7	22	6.1
More than Once	109	42.9	48	45.3	157	43.6
Sexual Hostility (SEQ-L)						
Never	124	50.2	38	36.2	162	46.0
Once	13	5.3	4	3.8	17	4.8
More than Once	110	44.5	63	60.0	173	49.1
Unwanted Sexual Attention (SEQ-L)						
Never	72	29.4	25	23.6	97	27.6
Once	11	4.5	0	0	11	3.1
More than Once	162	66.1	81	76.4	243	69.2

While many students reported experiencing a harassing behavior, only 9.6% of students answered affirmatively to the question, "Have you ever been sexually harassed

while at the university?" Only 9.6% of Mexican American students and 13.6% of Caucasians students answered yes to this question.

Results thus far indicate that sexually harassing behaviors are experiences reported by many students, but few students actually indicate they are harassed on their university campuses. Of particular importance in this study is the examination of differences in rates of harassment experienced by Mexican American and Caucasian students. These are examined below in sections divided by hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1a. Mexican American students will report more sexually harassing behaviors than Caucasian students.

In order to assess for differences between prevalence rates of harassing behaviors for Mexican American and Caucasian students, a one-way MANOVA was run with ethnicity of the student as the classifier variable and scores on the three subscales of the SEQ and the three subscales of the SEQ-L as the dependent variables (F (6,310) = 2.13, p = .05). Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was run to test for violations of the homogeneity of covariance matrices assumption. A violation was found to occur. However, an examination of the sum-of-squares cross products matrices revealed that the F-statistic was conservative and not liberal. Hence, the results are still deemed valid (Stevens, 1996). An inspection of the differences in the mean scores between Mexican Americans and Caucasians revealed that on each of the subscales except the SEQ sexual coercion subscale, Caucasians reported higher frequency of harassment (see Table 4).

In order to decipher where differences between the groups lay, individual one-way ANOVAs were run using each of the subscales as dependent variables. Statistically

significant differences between the two groups were found on the following subscales: SEQ gender harassment subscale (F (1,354) = 3.82, p = .05), SEQ-L sexual hostility subscale (F (1,350) = 7.37, p = .01), and the SEQ-L unwanted sexual attention subscale (F (1,349) = 4.88, p = .03).

Table 4

Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Ethnicity on the SEQ and SEQ-L

Scale	Mexican American (n=222)	Caucasian (n=95)
Gender Harassment - SEQ	.55 (.64)	.71(.77)
Unwanted Sexual Attention- SEQ	.43(.65)	.58(.72)
Sexual Coercion - SEQ	.01(.18)	.00 (.13)
Sexist Hostility - SEQ-L	.50(.68)	.53(.70)
Sexual Hostility - SEQ-L	.54 (.77)	.77 (.88)
Unwanted Sexual Attention-SEQ-L	.55(.64)	.69 (.69)

Note: Item responses are as follows: 0 - never; 1-once; 2- sometimes, 3 - often, and 4 - very often.

Hypothesis 1b. Mexican American students will be less likely than Caucasian students to label the offensive behaviors as harassment.

A chi square analysis was performed using responses to the question, "Have you ever been sexually harassed?" No significant differences were found in the patterns of responses presented by Mexican American and Caucasian university students (X^2(1, N=363) = 2.89, p = .09). It should be noted that 79.7% of Mexican Americans and 77.9%

of Caucasians reported experiencing a sexually harassing behavior on the SEQ or SEQ-L. Of those students who had experienced a sexually harassing behavior, only 9.6% indicated they had been harassed in response to the question, "Have you ever been harassed while at the university?" Of all Mexican Americans experiencing a sexually harassing behavior, only 7.9% indicated they had been harassed in their response to this question, while only 13.6% of Caucasians experiencing such a behavior indicated being harassed.

Research Question 1. How is acculturation related to amount of harassment experienced?

Correlational analyses were run using the SEQ and SEQ-L subscale scores and the acculturation subscale scores. No significant correlations were found.

Responses to Sexual Harassment

Hypothesis 2. Mexican American students will report more indirect methods of responding (e.g., ignoring the behavior or avoiding the offender) and fewer support-seeking strategies (e.g., talking to a friend or family member) or direct strategies (e.g., confronting the harasser or reporting the offender) than Caucasian students.

Of the entire sample, 286 students listed an offensive behavior and chose to complete the questions regarding their responses to the harassing behaviors. Chi-square analyses were performed on each response style to assess whether or not differences exist in the types of responses used by Mexican American and Caucasian students. Chi-square values were as follows: ignoring ($X^2(1, N=273) = .05, p = .82$), avoiding ($X^2(1, N=273) = 06, p = .81$), seeking out support ($X^2(1, N=273) = .64, p = .43$), confronting ($X^2(1,$

N=273) = 1.92, p = .17), and reporting (X^2(1, N=273) = 1.33, p = .25). No significant differences in types of response strategies were found between the two ethnicities. Chosen responses are listed by frequency in Table 5 (see Table 5). It should be noted that respondents could indicate more than one response type (e.g., they chose both to ignore the behavior and to avoid the person who performed the behavior). Also, participants were asked to report their response to the most offensive behavior experienced. When analyzing which items the participants listed as most offensive, no pattern emerged. Students reported being most offended by a variety of items ranging from gender harassment to sexual coercion. Especially noteworthy are participants' responses to the question, "If you chose to later report a behavior, where would you go?" Only 6.8% of respondents answered this question correctly by stating they would report the behavior to the Dean of Students.

Table 5

Responses to Harassing Behaviors by Ethnicity

Response	Mexican American	Caucasian
Ignored behavior	65.3%	63.9%
Avoided person who performed behavior	26.3%	27.7%
Talked to someone	18.4%	14.5%
Confronted person who performed behavior	25.8%	18.1%
Reported the offensive behavior	1.6%	0%

Power of Offender

Students who indicated experiencing an offensive behavior reported that the following individuals had offended them: 9.5% faculty (*n*=25), 3.8% staff (*n*=10), 69.7% other students (*n* = 184), 1.1% graduate students (*n*=3), and 15.9% reported not knowing the status of their offender (*n*=42). Mexican Americans reported that the following individuals offended them: 10.9% faculty (*n*=20), 3.8% staff (*n*=7), 71.2% other students (*n*=131), .5% graduate students (*n*=1), and 13.6% reported not knowing who the offender was (*n*=25). In comparison, Caucasians reported the following breakdown of offender status: 6.3% faculty (*n*=5), 3.8% staff (*n*=3), 66.3% students (*n*=53), 2.5% graduate students (*n*=2), and 21.3% reported not knowing who their harasser was (*n*=17). The majority of offenders were male (92.8%).

Hypothesis 3a. Regardless of offender status, Mexican American students will perceive the offender as more powerful than Caucasian students will.

A two-way MANOVA was run to assess the differences between Mexican American and Caucasian students in their perception of the six types of power of the offender. The classifier variables in the MANOVA were ethnicity of the student and status of the offender (faculty/staff, student, or unknown) while the dependent variables were the scores on each of the six subscales measuring power. Item mean scores and standard deviations for this analysis can be seen in Table 6. A significant main effect for ethnicity (F (6, 221) = 4.39, $p < .01$), and offender status were found (F (12, 444) = 4.67, $p < .01$), as well as an interaction effect for ethnicity by offender status (F (12, 444) = 3.25, $p < .01$). Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was run to test for

violations of the homogeneity of covariance matrices assumption. A violation was found to occur. However, an examination of the sum-of-squares cross products matrices revealed that the F-statistic was conservative and not liberal. Hence, the results are still deemed valid (Stevens, 1996).

In order to decipher where differences between the groups lay, individual two-way ANOVAs were run using each of the subscales as dependent variables. Statistically significant differences between Mexican Americans and Caucasians were found on the following subscales: reward power (F (1, 242) = 9.96, p <.01), referent power (F (1, 247) = 3.98, p < .05), coercion power (F (1, 247) = 12.03, p < .01), and legitimate power (F (1, 250) = 13.68, p < .01). Statistically significant differences between offender status groups were found on the following subscales: reward power (F (2, 242) = 10.22, p <.01), information power (F (2, 247) = 3.59, p = .03), coercion power (F (2, 247) = 14.47, p < .01), expertise power (F (2, 248) = 3.38, p = .04), and legitimate power (F (2, 250) = 13.21, p < .01). Individual two-way ANOVAs found statistically significant interaction effects between offender status and ethnicity on the following subscales: reward power (F (2, 242) = 6.07, p <.01), coercion power (F (2, 247) = 8.66, p < .01), and legitimate power (F (2, 250) = 8.34, p < .01).

A perusal of the means scores presented in the Table below shows that, overall, students attributed little power to their offenders. The interaction effect observed in this analysis leads to the conclusion that Mexican American students attributed greater power to their student offenders than Caucasians in the following areas of power: reward, coercion, and legitimate. However, Caucasians students attributed significantly more

power to their faculty/staff offenders than Mexican American students in these same areas of power. For referent power, Caucasians, in comparison to Mexican Americans, perceived their offenders as having significantly greater power regardless of the offenders' status.

Table 6

Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Ethnicity and Offender Status on Power Scales

Scale	Mexican American (n=159)			Caucasian (n=73)		
	Faculty/Staff (n = 24)	Student (n = 113)	Don't Know (n=22)	Faculty/Staff (n=7)	Student (n=51)	Don't Know (n=15)
Reward Power	1.65(.91)	1.37(.66)	1.14 (.33)	2.62 (.91)	1.28 (.52)	1.48 (.63)
Refer Power	1.38(.50)	1.40(.70)	1.11(.23)	1.52(.74)	1.62(.74)	1.40(.74)
Inform. Power	1.75(.85)	1.48(.77)	1.05 (.21)	1.86 (.74)	1.69 (.84)	1.44 (.87)
Coerc. Power	1.48(.69)	1.27(.60)	1.22 (.49)	2.63 (1.12)	1.20 (.45)	1.47 (.79)
Expert. Power	1.72(.83)	1.40(.70)	1.14 (.38)	1.79 (.85)	1.52 (.60)	1.35(.64)
Legit. Power	1.33(.62)	1.20(.47)	1.08 (.25)	2.33(1.33)	1.15 (.42)	1.27 (.57)

Note: Item responses are as follows: 1-strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3- neutral, 4 - agree, 5 - strongly agree.

Hypothesis 3b. Regardless of offender status, Mexican American students will perceive Caucasian offenders as more powerful than minority offenders in comparison to Caucasian students.

A two-way MANOVA was used to assess differences between Mexican American and Caucasian students in their perception of the six types of power of the offender, with the classifier variables being ethnicity of the student and ethnicity of the

offender. Item mean scores and standard deviations for this analysis can be seen in Table 7. A significant main effect was found for offender ethnicity (F (6,165) = 4.14, p <.01), but neither a main effect for student ethnicity or an interaction effect was found. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was run to test for violations of the homogeneity of covariance matrices assumption. A violation was found to occur. However, an examination of the sum-of-squares cross products matrices revealed that the F-statistic was conservative and not liberal. Hence, the results are still deemed valid (Stevens, 1996). For all types of power, Caucasian offenders were perceived as more powerful than Mexican American offenders.

Individual two-way ANOVAs were then run for each type of power. Significant main effects for offender ethnicity were found for the following types of power: referent power (F (1,189) = 47.43, p <.01), information power (F (1,189) = 8.31, p <.01), and expertise power (F (1,190) = 17.83, p <.01).

Table 7

Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Mexican Americans and Caucasians by Offender Ethnicity on the Social Power Scales

	Mexican American Students (n=120)		Caucasian Students (n=54)	
Scale	Caucasian Offender (n = 27)	Hispanic Offender (n=93)	Caucasian Offender (n = 32)	Hispanic Offender (n=22)
Reward Power	1.52 (.79)	1.30 (.57)	1.40 (.63)	1.33 (.57)
Referent Power	1.65 (.87)	1.30 (.56)	1.71 (.76)	1.37 (.65)
Information Power	1.73 (1.01)	1.36 (.64)	1.79 (.93)	1.41 (.66)
Coercion Power	1.47 (.71)	1.19 (.49)	1.26 (.66)	1.36 (.70)
Expertise Power	1.86 (.97)	1.26 (.52)	1.65 (.70)	1.27 (.45)
Legitimate Power	1.36 (.62)	1.13 (.41)	1.17 (.46)	1.21 (.60)

Note: Item responses are as follows: 1-strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3- neutral, 4 - agree, 5 - strongly agree.

Research Question 2. How is acculturation related to perceptions of offender power?

Correlations were calculated between the scores on the Anglo and Mexican Orientation acculturation subscales and the scores on the power subscales. Only one significant correlation was found between referent power and Mexican Orientation (r = -.184, p = .02).

Sexual Harassment Tolerance

Hypothesis 4a. Mexican American students will report greater tolerance of sexually harassing behaviors than Caucasian students.

An independent sample t-test was performed using the total score on SHAS to compare tolerance levels of Mexican American and Caucasian students. Mexican American students were found to be more tolerant of harassment than Caucasian students (t (321) = 1.83, p = .04 (one-tailed)).

Table 8

Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Ethnicity on the Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale

Scale	Mexican American (n=223)	Caucasian (n=100)
SHAS	3.62 (.54)	3.50 (.53)

Note: Item responses are as follows: 1-strongly agree, 2 - agree, 3- neutral, 4 - disagree, 5 - strongly disagree.

Hypothesis 4b. More acculturated Mexican American students will report less tolerance of sexually harassing behaviors than less acculturated students.

A correlation was run using the scores on the Mexican American and Anglo Orientation subscales of the acculturation scale and the total score on the Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale. No significant correlations were found.

Consequences of Sexually Harassing Behaviors

Research Question 3. Mexican American students will report greater rates of negative symptomatology (including depression and PTSD symptomatology) when compared to Caucasian students.

A one-way ANOVA was run with student ethnicity as a classifier variable and scores on the PTSD scale as the dependent variable for those individuals who reported a harassing behavior on the SEQ or SEQ-L. No significant differences were found (F (1,258) = .35, p = .56). Likewise, a one-way ANOVA was run with student ethnicity as a classifier variable and scores on the BDI scale as the dependent variable for those individuals who reported a harassing behavior on the SEQ or SEQ-L. No significant differences were found (F (1,242) = .2.38, p = .12). Thus, Mexican American students did not report greater negative symptomatology than Caucasian students.

In support of prior research, a positive correlation was found between scores on the SEQ and the PTSD scale (r = .32, p < .01), scores on the SEQ and the Beck Depression Inventory (r = .19, p < .01), scores on the SEQ-L and the PTSD scale (r = .33, p < .01), and scores on the SEQ-L and the Beck Depression Inventory (r = .12, p < .05), indicating that those students experiencing more offensive behavior also reported experiencing greater negative symptomatology.

Table 9

Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Ethnicity on Symptomatology Scales

Scale	Mexican American	Caucasian
PTSD	.13 (.24)	.15 (.29)
Beck Depression Inventory	.38 (.38)	.30 (.30)

Note: Item responses range from 0, not at all, to 3, almost always.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This chapter reviews the results of this study within the cultural contexts of ethnicity and power, exploring how these factors intertwine and impact the experiences of women harassed on university campuses. Key findings are highlighted, particularly as they relate to prior research regarding sexual harassment in university populations. Contributions and implications of these findings are then addressed, followed by limitations of the dissertation design and future directions for research.

Key Findings: The Intertwining of Culture and Power in Harassing Behaviors

The study used a sample of 399 Mexican American and Caucasian female university students from three universities in south and central Texas. The following subsections give a summary of the key findings in these areas which enlighten the intertwining of culture, ethnicity, and power: 1) harassment prevalence, 2) perceived power of the offender, 3) harassment tolerance, 4) response to harassing behaviors, and 5) negative correlates of harassment. Significant differences were found between Mexican American and Caucasian students in their experience of the prevalence of harassing behaviors, perceptions of offender's power, and their tolerance of harassment. Moreover, Mexican American and Caucasian women were found to be similar in their labeling of their harassing behaviors as harassment, their responses to harassing behaviors, and the negative correlates of harassment. Where appropriate, the specific interplay between acculturation and these variables is also discussed.

Harassment Prevalence

A primary purpose of the dissertation is to provide data on the prevalence of sexual harassment of Mexican American students on university campuses and how this prevalence compares to Caucasian students. Approximately three-fourths of the study's participants (79.8%) experienced some form of sexually harassing behavior, a finding that coincides with prior research of university students' experiences of harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Sandler & Shoop, 1997). The most common form of sexually harassing behavior experienced by participants was gender harassment (e.g., sexist remarks, sexual jokes), which likewise replicates previous findings (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). However, it should be noted that the mean score for each type of harassment for both Mexican Americans and Caucasians (e.g., gender harassment) indicated that most women experienced such behaviors somewhere between never and once. Thus, while many students did experience at least one of these harassing behaviors, frequency of such behavior on campuses may not be as high as some statistics may imply.

Differences did exist between Mexican American and Caucasian students' in their experience of harassment prevalence. In contrast to the hypothesis that Mexican Americans would experience greater prevalence of harassing behaviors, Caucasians in this study reported significantly higher incidents of harassing behavior. This finding contradicts minority vulnerability theories, which predict that women from minority populations experience more harassment due to power differentials between minority and majority cultures, racial stereotypes of minority women, and cultural marginality (DeFour, 1996; Gruber & Bjorn, 1986; Murrell, 1996; Segura, 1992). However, this

finding is consistent with results from a recent study of employed women. In the employment setting used in the study, non-Hispanic White women reported higher incidences of harassment than Hispanic women (Shupe, Cortina, Ramos, Fitzgerald, & Salisbury, 2002), a finding which the authors of the study found surprising as well.

One explanation may be that women who hold more egalitarian views present a greater threat to some males' feelings of power in the work environment than women with more traditional views of gender roles. This threat to men increases their possibility of being harassed in an effort to decrease their power in the workplace (O'Hare & O'Donahue, 1998). Prior research provides support for this explanation, finding that women who hold more egalitarian gender beliefs are more likely to experience harassing behaviors (Dall'Ara & Maass, 1999; O'Hare & O'Donahue, 1998). Because Caucasian women have been found to hold less traditional gender role beliefs than Hispanic women, Caucasians may have been at a greater risk for experiencing harassing behaviors because of their perceived power. Such an explanation is consistent with the view that sexual harassment is a tool used to "maintain male dominance occupationally and therefore economically by intimidating, discouraging, or precipitating removal of women from work" (Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982, p. 40).

While prevalence of harassing behaviors did differ significantly between Mexican American and Caucasian students, they did not differ in their self-reported labeling of behaviors as harassment. While a majority of students reported experiencing harassing behavior, only 9.6% of all students reported ever having been harassed, in response to the question, "Have you ever been sexually harassed while at the university?" This finding

replicated earlier research (Magley et al., 1999). Students, who did answer affirmatively to this question in the present study, thereby stating they had been sexually harassed in their viewpoint, indicated a variety of reasons for this belief. In response to the qualitative question, "How were you harassed?" students reported the following categories of behavior: 1) sexualized comments or derogatory statements ("guys making comments about my breasts"), 2) fondling/inappropriate touching ("unwanted advances and/or mild physical contact such as a butt grab or shoulder rubbing"), 3) sexual coercion ("pleading to have sex with me even though I clearly didn't want to"), and 4) attempted rape ("my roommate had a male friend over. Woke up at 5 am because I felt someone tried to grab me, it was that guy. He was drunk and I pushed him off").

A number of possible reasons may explain this gap between the occurrence of harassing behavior and the labeling of such behavior as actual sexual harassment by the students. Severity of harassment may have impacted the interpretation of the behaviors, especially since prevalence of gender harassment ranked the highest in this sample. Severity of harassment has been shown to impact the labeling of harassing behavior, with more severe forms (e.g., sexual coercion) being more likely to be deemed harassment by participants (Barak, Fisher, & Houston, 1992; Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Further, because participants identified the offender as a fellow student much more frequently than a faculty or staff member, they may have been less likely to consider the behavior harassment. Hence, in line with prior findings, offensive behavior by peers is less likely to be deemed harassment (Giuffre & Williams, 1994; Stockdale, Vauz, & Cashin, 1995).

Additionally, many students reported experiencing behaviors only one time or less, making them less likely to identify such behavior as harassment.

In the present study, no relationship was found between level of acculturation and experience of harassing behaviors. This particular finding contradicts a recent study, which found that more acculturated Hispanics experienced more sexual harassment than their less acculturated counterparts (Shupe et al., 2002). However, Shupe et al.'s study was completed with a working-class sample of women rather than with university students. Like those findings, the current study also contradicts prior research regarding minority vulnerability to harassment (e.g., DeFour, 1990; Murrell, 1996), as Shupe et al.'s results suggested that as Hispanic women become more acculturated, they were more likely to be harassed. However, the present study's findings should be generalized with caution as it is possible that, despite efforts to emphasize the anonymity of responses, the Mexican American women in this study felt more distress about breaking norms of "sexual silence," thereby under-reporting their actual experience, as was suggested by previous researchers (Shupe et al., 2002). The findings of this dissertation study suggest that the minority vulnerability theories of harassment may indeed be faulty, at least in regard to Mexican American females in university settings. Education may play a mediating part in the impact of acculturation on harassment experiences.

Responses to Harassment

Mexican American and Caucasian students appeared to respond in a similar fashion to sexually harassing behaviors. A majority of students chose simply to ignore the behavior. For Mexican American students, this follows norms of sexual silence (Marin &

Gomez, 1996). It is also plausible that for Mexican American students may be less likely to report harassment by faculty and staff due to cultural norms of respect for those in authority. Thus, while the majority reported being moderately intolerant of harassment, most chose to ignore the behavior, suggesting that while they did not approve of the behavior, they chose to conceal their disapproval from the offender.

When students were asked why they chose to respond in the manner reported, those who ignored the behavior or avoided the person cited a variety of reasons, including 1) not wanting to draw attention to themselves (e.g., "I didn't want to make a scene"), 2) believing that if they responded more directly, the situation might have escalated (e.g., "If you draw attention to it, the problem gets bigger"), 3) believing it was not "a big deal" and not wanting to waste time on it, 4) being caught off guard and not knowing how else to respond, 5) believing that reporting the behavior would not change the situation (e.g., "Sometimes reporting someone does not help. No action is being performed to the person and I didn't want to be treated worse"), and 6) believing that taking a more direct approach would cause problems in the future (e.g., future bias or fear of personal harm to one's self or one's property, "He keyed my car and threatened to slash my tires"). It should be noted that the majority of students (93.2%) reported not knowing where to go to report a harassing behavior if they desired to do so. Hence, it is plausible that many students simply chose not to report the behavior because they did not possess the information they would need to make it a plausible response option for them.

Perceived Power of the Offender

Power explanations, which suggest that imbalances in power between individuals lay a foundation for the occurrence of harassment, are a widely accepted theory explaining the existence of sexual harassment in society (Sandler & Shoop, 1997; Tangri et al., 1982). Yet results of this study found that, overall, students perceived offenders as holding very limited power, which may not be very surprising in light of the fact that so few students (13.3% of those who indicated experiencing an offensive behavior) identified persons in authority (staff or faculty) as the offenders. Hence, power may not be an integral factor for those experiencing peer-to-peer harassment in a college setting.

Interestingly, in contrast to prior literature suggesting that minority women may experience greater power differentials than Caucasians due to racial stereotyping and patriarchal cultural influences (Barak, 1997; Pavich, 1986), this study found that Caucasian women, across all subtypes of power, perceived faculty and staff offenders as more powerful than did Mexican American students. An intriguing interaction effect between ethnicity of the student and offender status occurred on three types of power: reward power, coercion power, and legitimate power. While Caucasians attributed more power to faculty and staff on these three subcategories, Mexican American students attributed more power to student offenders. Thus, while little power was attributed to offenders overall, it appears that power may be viewed differently by both ethnic groups. Hence, structural power imbalances, such as those granted by status and roles within an organization (Quina & Carlson, 1989; Stockdale, 1996), may be more keenly discerned by Caucasian students, while patriarchal power, that is typical of less egalitarian gender

roles (Pavich, 1986) and can exist between peers, may be more palpable to Mexican American students.

At the same time, it needs to be noted that neither Caucasian nor Mexican American students attributed much power to their offenders, with mean scores indicating disagreement about the extent of the existence of such power. It should also be noted that regardless of student ethnicity and across offender status, Caucasian offenders were perceived as more powerful than Hispanic offenders, reflecting confirmation of a belief that Caucasians hold more power in society, usually through access to greater financial security and higher social status (Quina & Carlson, 1989).

Again, in contrast to minority vulnerability theories (e.g., DeFour, 1990; Murrell, 1996), no positive relationships were found between power and acculturation levels. Thus, less affiliated Hispanic women failed to report a greater perception of offender power than their more acculturated counterparts, who reported even less desire to identify with their offenders. It is plausible that more educated Mexican American women have greater feelings of empowerment, thereby causing them to attribute less power to their offenders, regardless of their cultural affiliation. Hence, level of education may be a mediating factor which future researchers wish to explore.

Sexual Harassment Tolerance

Significant differences were found between Mexican American and Caucasian students in their tolerance of harassment with Mexican Americans reporting greater tolerance. This finding supports many Hispanic cultural beliefs which require women to be sexually passive and to overlook sexual exploration and expressiveness by men in

their culture, which might include such harassing behavior as coarse joking and fondling (Marin & Gomez, 1996; Oaks & Landrum-Brown, 1997; Pavich, 1986). Overall, however, both ethnicities were found to hold moderate levels of intolerance for sexually harassing behaviors.

In the present sample, level of acculturation had no association with harassment tolerance. Again, this finding contradicts cultural norms of sexuality in Hispanic cultures, which accept greater sexual prowess in males yet expect passivity in females (Marin & Gomez, 1996; Oaks & Landrum-Brown, 1997). It is plausible that while Mexican American women may follow sexual norms by responding in an accepting manner to harassing behaviors by males, they may, in fact, not consider such behavior acceptable. These women may choose to accept harassment outwardly while inwardly condemning the behavior. Results regarding chosen responses to harassment which were primarily indirect in nature further elucidate this complex relationship between attitudes towards behavior and actual responses to it.

Negative Correlates of Harassment

No differences were evident between Mexican American and Caucasian students in reporting depression or post-traumatic stress symptomatology. Thus, ethnicity did not appear to influence the actual psychological impact of harassing behaviors. However, in support of prior research (Hamilton et al., 1987; Magley et al., 1999), low, positive correlations were found between amount of harassing behaviors experienced and both reports of depression symptoms and post-traumatic stress symptomatology. Hence, students who experienced more harassing behaviors reported suffering more negative

psychological symptoms. However, this did not vary by ethnicity as had been predicted. In part, this may be due to the similar response styles that Caucasians and Mexican American students reported choosing (e.g., Mexican Americans and Caucasians sought similar amounts of support from others).

Intertwining of Ethnicity and Power in the Experience of Harassing Behaviors

Thus, Mexican Americans and Caucasians appeared to have similar experiences in a number of areas. Both groups of students were unlikely to label their experience with harassing behaviors as harassment. Ethnicity therefore played less of an integral role in students' personal perceptions of harassing behaviors as "sexual harassment." Across the board, very few women actually responded that they had been sexually harassed in their own perception. Another area of similarity between the groups was their chosen responses to harassing behaviors with both groups primarily choosing indirect responses, including ignoring the behavior or avoiding the harasser. Finally, both groups experienced similar levels of negative symptomatology, with Mexican Americans not reporting greater negative effects than their Caucasian counterparts.

While there were a number of similarities between the groups, differences did appear in the following areas: prevalence of harassing behaviors, attribution of power, and tolerance. Caucasians experienced greater frequencies of harassing behaviors and attributed greater power to faculty or staff offenders, while Mexican Americans attributed greater power to student offenders. In this educational setting, Mexican American students did not appear to be "targeted" for harassment because of their minority status. Interestingly, Mexican American females did not appear to be more in tune with power

differentials in authoritative relationships, but were more aware of patriarchal power between peers. The groups also differed in harassment tolerance with Mexican Americans reporting greater harassment tolerance than Caucasians. More tolerant attitudes of harassment appeared to reflect the cultural values which support sexual silence and female passivity. Interestingly, acculturation level did not appear to play a mediating factor in any of the factors of interest, including tolerance of harassment and experience of harassing behaviors. While Mexican Americans and Caucasians did report some similarity in their responses to and consequences of harassing behavior, they did differ significantly in prevalence of harassing behaviors, attribution of power, and tolerance of harassment.

Contributions of the Dissertation Study

This dissertation was designed to expand previous research on sexual harassment in university settings to include the experiences of sexual harassment of Mexican American university women, considering the intertwining of power and culture in their experiences. The study's first purpose was to establish the prevalence of harassment in university settings for Mexican American female students in comparison to Caucasian students, an important contribution to the literature since prior research has been contradictory about differences in harassment prevalence between minority and majority groups (e.g., Niebuhr & Boyls, 1991; Wyatt & Riederle, 1994). Findings from this study indicate that Caucasian female students experience greater frequency of harassing behaviors than Mexican American women, contrary to the predictions of minority marginalization theories.

No studies have specifically focused on the experiences of Mexican American women in university populations. One particular strength of this study is the sampling of Mexican American women from various locations throughout Texas, including a city on the border of Mexico, which provided information about women of varying acculturation levels. In contrast to prior studies of working Hispanic women, Mexican American women's experiences of harassing behaviors were not correlated with level of correlation, suggesting that education may play a mediating role.

Another contribution of this study is the expansion of research in how women of color respond to harassment, specifically Mexican American women, an area of research which has yet to be addressed in the literature (Murrell, 1996). Prior research has also largely ignored the psychological consequences of sexual harassment for minority women (Murrell, 1996), which this study has aimed to address. Consideration of the context of culture in both responses to harassment and negative consequences of harassment is, therefore, a particular strength of this study. Interestingly, despite differences in tolerance levels for harassment, Mexican Americans did not significantly differ in their chosen responses to harassing behavior nor did they experience greater negative symptomatology than their Caucasian counterparts, suggesting that culture may not play as influential a role in response style or level of consequences experienced.

The inclusion of a measurement of the perceived power of an offender is another important contribution of this investigation. While a majority of researchers acknowledge the influence of power in sexual harassment, little research has actually included a measure of such power, a common criticism levied against power theories of

harassment (Cleveland & Kerst, 1993). This study chose to expand the literature in this area by using French and Raven's (1959) conceptualization of power, a suggestion made by DeFour (1996), to examine the influence of power in harassment. An additional criticism of power models of harassment has been that they fail to consider the intertwining of gender and ethnicity in power dynamics present in both academia and the business world (Rospenda, et al., 1998). The findings of this study suggest that perceptions of power differ by ethnicity, especially in regard to the status of the offender (e.g., faculty vs. student) with Mexican Americans granting greater power to peers while Caucasians perceive greater power in faculty/staff relationships.

This particular study contributes to the literature by considering several factors, including ethnicity, gender, and acculturation, while simultaneously examining the role of power, an understudied factor in harassment. The major contribution of this dissertation has been the unique consideration of the intertwining of power and culture in the experience of sexual harassment of Mexican American female students.

Implications for Universities

The results of this current study provide universities with rich information to contemplate as they move towards improving campus safety for female students. This dissertation confirms the pervasiveness of the problem of sexual harassment on university campuses with 79.8% of all students reporting that they had experienced at least one sexually harassing behavior. Perhaps what is most distressing, however, is that 15.3% of students had experienced sexual coercion on campus, the most severe form of sexual harassment, including such behaviors as sexual bribery, sexual threats, sexual assault, and

quid pro quo harassment. This statistic in particular calls attention to the behaviors that go unnoticed on university campuses and underscores why sexual harassment is not a frivolous matter.

The findings underscore the importance of universities better informing their students about what constitutes sexual harassment. Although the majority of students reported experiencing a sexually harassing behavior, only a minority of students (9.6%) stated they had been harassed, pointing to the need of educating students about what is and what is not acceptable behavior. This may in part be attributed to the fact that most students (71.2%) reported experiencing the offensive behavior from a fellow student, which may not fit their definition of sexual harassment. Deans of Students and other university personnel who hold responsibility in this area may wish to refocus their brochures and websites on harassment to include student-to-student examples of harassment to enlighten students that the university's protection extends to peer relationships, not simply to faculty/staff and student. Additionally, administrators may wish to provide clearer definitions of what constitutes harassment to aid Mexican American students, who reported more tolerance of harassment, in identifying behaviors which are illegal and inappropriate on campus. Universities may wish to revise their written and website materials to include scenarios of specific behaviors in order to help students better grasp what harassment might look like on university campuses. Additionally, such information must be provided in greater depth to faculty and staff members. Collectively, 14.7% of students reported that their offender was a faculty/staff member, a number that should be cause for concern for administrators. Faculty and staff

must also be further educated on what constitutes harassment of students, in order to protect both themselves and the students on campus.

The need for education of the student population on definitions of harassment underscores the importance of addressing the implications of these findings for men on campus, especially with 92.8% of offenders being male. Men have consistently been found to be more tolerant of harassment than their female counterparts (Ford & Donis, 1996; Jones & Remland, 1992). Prior evaluations of harassment training have found that the use of harassment training videos and workshops are effective in increasing knowledge of what constitutes harassment, but do not change these deeply embedded attitudes of harassment tolerance (Bingham & Scherer, 2001; Kearney, Rochlen, & King, 2004; Perry, Kulik & Schmidtke, 1998). Universities will need to become more proactive in their choices of prevention strategies to include more experiential training, greater discussion time, and more face-to-face communication to target these long held beliefs which cannot be altered by one-time trainings at the beginning of employment or during school orientation (Caciop0o & Petty, 1989; Kearney, et al., 2004).

Further, administrators need to better educate students regarding what to do if they experience sexual harassment while at the university. Few students (6.8%) were actually able to name where they should go to report sexually harassing behaviors. This informs readers that current mechanisms used to disseminate information about harassment policies are not reaching the masses. Many universities commonly use brochures and short presentations at orientation to inform students of such policies, a time at which students may be feeling overloaded by the vast amount of information presented

to them at a single time. Administrators may wish to consider adding other ways to disseminate information, such as making regular use of university newspapers, requiring information to be presented on course syllabi, or spreading information during the National Sexual Assault Awareness Week. While men's experiences of harassing behaviors were not reviewed in this study, another study of a university population found that 25% of men reported experiencing at least one harassing behaviors (Cochran et al., 1997). Hence, universities should also consider the distribution of information which includes men as harassment victims, not just offenders, to increase awareness of the problem of harassment for men, an often overlooked phenomenon (Gerrity, 2000).

Limitations of the Dissertation Study and Directions for Future Research

The primary goal of this dissertation was to expand research about the harassment experiences of minority women, specifically Mexican American women on university campuses. As with past research concerning Hispanic women, a number of challenges in this area still remain. It is possible that the results of this study should not be interpreted at "face value" as Mexican American women, in agreement with a cultural value of "sexual silence," may hesitate to report their actual experiences dealing with sexually harassing behaviors (Shupe et al., 2002). Although extensive efforts were made to insure the anonymity of respondents, messages regarding condemnation for women who speak about sexual matters may have been too strong to overcome. Additionally, since the Mexican American students in this study were more tolerant of harassment than the Caucasian students, it is possible that they were less aware of harassing behaviors that they did experience, and thereby failed to report such behaviors on the surveys.

Other methods of collecting data on sexual harassment in Mexican American populations are therefore strongly encouraged. Qualitative methods, such as the use of focus groups and interviews, may provide respondents with a greater sense of security so that they may be more open to respond without reservation or concern. Hence, a study combining both quantitative and qualitative methods of reporting harassing experiences would be ideal in affirming or contradicting the findings of this study. Future researchers might first wish to have students complete the sexual harassment questionnaires and then meet with students individually to discuss their responses. For example, researchers could ask respondents how they defined harassment, what made particular behaviors offensive or non-offensive to them, and whether they consider other behaviors not listed on the questionnaires to be offensive or harassing. Researchers could also ask participants to give examples of harassing behaviors they had experienced and how they chose to respond in order to better understand what behaviors were offensive to them and what factors influenced their choice of response. Qualitative responses might aid the field by adding information to the gaps in the literature caused by collecting only quantitative results. While many students indicate they have experienced harassing behaviors, it is possible that many of them do not view such behaviors as harassment. Hence, it would be ideal to delve into what Mexican American students define as harassment and how they feel they experience or do not experience harassment on today's campuses. By providing greater qualitative depth, researchers may gather more complete answers to the question of prevalence rates of harassment among Mexican American populations and how to

meet the needs of women on college campuses by giving them a larger voice in the expression of the problem.

Further, while the surveys were given to English-speaking students, a large number of students (69.1%) reported coming from homes where both English and Spanish were spoken, and 15.1% were raised in Spanish-speaking homes only. Hence, it is possible that for some students, giving the surveys in Spanish would have benefited their understanding. Future researchers may wish to consider providing surveys in both Spanish and English to insure the most accurate receipt of information.

Potential under-reporting may also be caused by the particular use of measures relied upon in this study. One of the concerns when using self-report data regarding sexual harassment is asking participants to recall behaviors that have occurred in the past. Participants may have forgotten some of the harassing behaviors they experienced, or they may have alternatively reframed those experiences thereby no longer considering them as offensive experiences. This may cause under or over reporting, depending on the type of reframing performed by the participant. Again, future researchers may possibly counteract this problem by using personal interviews to gain a clearer picture of the behaviors experienced by harassment. This may also be counteracted by only asking participants to report on harassment that has occurred in a shorter period of time, such as the past six months, which would increase the accuracy of responses.

An additional limitation of this study is the lack of variability in responses to several of the measures. For example, most women did not report significant depression on the Beck Depression Inventory, nor did they report high levels of PTSD

symptomatology. Likewise, little variability was noted on the measurement of perceptions of offenders' power, with most women perceiving offenders as possessing little power. Future researchers may wish to focus on the development of instruments specifically to measure power differentials in harassing relationships.

Another limitation of this study is that it confines itself only to reports of behaviors experienced on university campuses by Mexican American and Caucasian female students. Generalizability of these results to other settings (e.g., businesses) or to other Hispanic populations should not be attempted. The experiences of Mexican American women in this particular setting may differ from Mexican-American women who are in the working class (Shupe et al., 2002). Future researchers may wish to consider a comparison of working women and students to gain insight into the differences between these two populations.

Finally, while a random sample of students from a particular set of classes was taken at the University of Texas at Austin, the use of convenience sampling was employed at the other two universities, thereby decreasing generalizability of results. This sample consisted primarily of students from liberal arts and education classes causing an underrepresentation of some students' experiences (e.g., engineering students). Females in non-traditional disciplines for women, such as computer science or engineering, may have greater experiences of harassment than women presented in this sample.

These limitations have offered some insight into future research possibilities that might provide further insight into the interconnections of culture and power in the

experience of sexual harassment. In many ways, the results of this study raised more questions than it answered. The following section will focus on two other primary areas of future research: 1) the role of power in harassment and 2) the role of acculturation and ethnicity in harassment.

The Role of Power in Harassment

One of the most widely accepted explanations of sexual harassment are power theories, which suggest that harassment occurs between persons possessing different levels of power, in which one party, through the authority afforded him or her in a patriarchal society, exploits that position by means of sexual harassment (Hemming, 1985; Stockdale, 1996). Of particular note in this study is that students did not perceive their offenders as having extensive power, yet sexually harassing behavior occurred nevertheless. Since the majority of students identified their offenders as fellow students, it is plausible that power may have played a lesser role in these instances of harassing behaviors. However, it is likewise possible that students may have difficulty acknowledging power differentials in peer-to-peer relationships, not accounting for power differentials caused by social forces, which afford men greater financial status and powerful roles in society as well as genetic differentials of physical strength or size (Quina & Carlson, 1989). While students did not consider their offenders as very powerful, many chose indirect methods of response, which could be interpreted as quiet acknowledgement of power differentials between the sexes. These same responses, however, might also indicate a woman's confidence in her own power, whereby ignoring

or avoiding offensive behaviors reflects a distinct choice not to take action in that particular moment.

Thus, future research may wish to address how the acknowledgement of or lack of awareness of power in relationships affects harassment prevalence, responses to harassment, and negative consequences of harassment. Further, researchers should examine whether or not power models of harassment hold true for peer-to-peer harassment. It appears that sexual harassment within peer relationships may present a different context which does not contain aspects of structural power that typically exist in other forms of workplace harassment (e.g., harassment from a professor or employer).

The Role of Acculturation and Ethnicity in Harassment

Mexican American students in this study reported a full range of acculturation levels, especially by location of their university. Students from Brownsville, Texas, a border town to Mexico, were less acculturated than Mexican American students from either Austin or San Antonio. Interestingly, findings from this dissertation study suggest that Mexican American students, regardless of acculturation level, experience harassment less frequently than Caucasian students. Yet prior research has found that harassment of Hispanic working-class women increases with affiliation to the mainstream U.S. culture (Shupe et al., 2002). Thus, it is quite plausible that acculturation becomes less of a mediating factor in harassment prevalence as level of education increases. Mexican American women pursuing education may be viewed by men in power as more threatening, regardless of acculturation status, while working class women may only emerge as threatening as they become more acculturated to mainstream society. Hence,

culture and power seem to be intertwined in the experience of sexual harassment for Mexican American women, but in a complex manner yet to be understood. Future research should examine the mediating factor of education in ascertaining the role of acculturation in harassment prevalence.

Conclusion

This dissertation provides insight into the intricate influences of both culture and power in the experience of sexually harassing behaviors in Mexican American university women. Interestingly, results from the study did not support minority marginalization theories of harassment, which propose that minority women would experience increased harassment. Rather, the study found that Caucasians experienced more frequent instances of harassment. Regardless of the differences between the two populations, the results support prior research, indicating that harassment, especially gender harassment, is still a widespread problem on university campuses.

Participants in the study seemed to be drawn to response styles which are indirect or avoidant in coping with their harassing experiences. If sexual harassment information were to be disseminated to an even greater extent among student populations, consciousness of both policies and the range of response options available for harassed students would be raised. Perhaps knowledge and increased awareness could aid students in overcoming their reluctance to report harassment to university officials.

Along with the wider dissemination of policies, students, faculty, and staff need basic education on precisely what constitutes sexual harassment. Although a majority of students indicated they had experienced harassing behaviors while at the university,

relatively few indicated that they had actually been sexually harassed. Thus, education would enlighten individuals about what constitutes sexual harassment. Education alone, however, will not be enough to overcome such problems. Culturally sensitive methods of reaching Mexican American women on this topic must be implemented to ensure their personal and academic growth in a safe environment.

Even though the doors of education have swung open for minorities and women in the last 100 years, it appears that some discriminatory practices may still be an all too common experience for women and minorities. By acknowledging the intertwining of culture and power in harassment, we can begin to understand the perception and experience of the sexual harassment of Mexican American women and how to better meet their needs on university campuses.

Appendix A

CONSENT FORM

Cover Letter to Participate in Research

The University of Texas at Austin

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The Principal Investigator (the person in charge of this research) or his/her representative will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Title of Research Study: Questions About Sexual Harassment

Principal Investigator(s), UT Affiliation, and Telephone Number(s):
Lisa Kearney, M.A – Doctoral Candidate, Dept. of Educational Psychology: (512) 567-5472
Lucia Gilbert, Ph.D. – Vice Provost and Professor: (512) 471-4409

Funding source: N/A

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to examine behavior experienced by students on college campuses and psychological outcomes. If you participate, you will be one of approximately six hundred people in the study.

What will be done if you take part in this research study?

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to fill out several questionnaires. These forms should take you no longer than 40 minutes to fill out. The surveys will help us to measure whether or not you have experienced offensive behavior while at the university. Additionally, the questions will ask about any negative symptoms you might currently be experiencing.

What are the possible discomforts and risks?

Some of these questions may be of a personal or sensitive nature. For example, one question asks whether or not you have been experiencing nightmares. Hence, you may experience some discomfort. However, you may skip questions if you wish. There may be risks that are unknown at this time. If you wish to discuss the information above or any other risks you may experience, you may ask questions now or call the Principal Investigator listed on the front page of this form.

What are the possible benefits to you or to others?

Potential benefits to you include raising awareness of your own experiences on campus and personal growth. Through exploration of your values and attitudes regarding these important issues, you may develop a heightened awareness of your own positions and be more able to clearly communicate these positions to others. Further, by raising awareness of the negative behaviors sometimes experienced by students, university administrators can begin to build programs and improve resources to address the needs of students on university campuses. By acknowledging how both power differentials and cultural differences interact with perceptions of and responses to offensive behavior, faculty, staff, and students can work together to increase levels of gender and cultural sensitivity on campus, making campuses safer for women and men in general.

If you choose to take part in this study, will it cost you anything?

Your participation will not cost you anything.

Will you receive compensation for your participation in this study?

No compensations will be given to you for participation in this study.

What if you are injured because of the study?

No treatment will be provided for risks incurred by the study. However, feel free to contact the university counseling center if you feel the need to discuss any emotions resulting from the completion of these surveys. The counseling center number is: UT-Austin (512) 471-3515, UT-Brownsville (956)544-8292, and St. Mary's University (210) 436-3135.

If you do not want to take part in this study, what other options are available to you?

Please note that your participation in this study in not a requirement. You may choose to stop participation in the study at any point. If you are participating for credit or extra credit for a class, please note that other options are available to complete these requirements. Contact your professor for details.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to refuse to be in the study, and your refusal will not influence current or future relationships with The University of Texas at Austin, St. Mary's University, or The University of Texas at Brownsville.

How can you withdraw from this research study?

Please state to the administrator of the surveys that you wish your surveys to not be included in the study itself.

If you wish to stop your participation in this research study for any reason, you should contact: Lisa Kearney, M.A. at (512) 567-5472. You are free to withdraw your consent and stop participation in this research study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits for which you may be entitled. Throughout the study, the researchers will notify you of new information that may become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

In addition, if you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Clarke A. Burnham, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, 512/232-4383.

How will your privacy and the confidentiality of your research records be protected?

In order to protect your confidentiality, no identifying information will be requested of you. Hence, none of the information you will provide can be linked to you in any manner.

If the results of this research are published or presented at scientific meetings, your identity will not be disclosed.

Will the researchers benefit from your participation in this *study?*

Yes, the information you provide may be used to improve the well being of students on university campuses. You will be also aiding the researcher in completing the requirements for her doctoral degree.

This cover letter is for your records.

If you feel that you have been harassed at your university, you may contact:

(at UT-Austin): Dr. Sherri Sanders, Associate Dean of Students (512) 471-9700
(at UT-Brownsville): Dr. Mari Fuentes-Martin, Dean of Students (956) 554-5141
(at St. Mary's University): Dr. Karen Johnson, Dean of Students (210) 436-3714

Appendix B

Demographics Form

1. What is your age? _____
2. I am a ☐ Male ☐ Female
3. I am a ☐ Freshman ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior ☐ Graduate Student
4. I am ☐ Hispanic/Latino/a (please specify (e.g., Cuban, Mexican American, etc):_____
   ☐ African-American ☐ Asian American ☐ Native American
   ☐ Caucasian ☐ Other (please specify:_____)
5. Where were you born?_____
6. Where were your parents born? Mother?_____Father?_____
7. Where were your grandparents born? Your mother's mother?_____
   Your mother's father? _____Your father's mother?_____
   Your father's father?_____
8. What languages were spoken in your home? _____
9. My family's approximate yearly income is: ☐ up to $20,000 ☐ $20,001-$40,000
   ☐ $40,001-$60,000 ☐ $60,001-$80,000 ☐ $80,001-$100,000 ☐ over $100,000
10. The college/university I currently attend is: _____.

Appendix C

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) – Shortened Version

On the next few pages we will be asking you various questions related to sexual harassment. Some of these questions may be sensitive, but please be assured that your responses will be completely anonymous and cannot be associated with you.

12. Have you ever been sexually harassed while at the university? ☐ Yes ☐ No

13. How were you harassed? _____

_____

_____

Read each of the situations listed and then check the box that matches how often you have had this experience. Some questions may appear repetitive, but please answer them despite this.

	How often did this happen?				
While at the university, have you ever been in a situation where any individuals…	**Never**	**Once**	**Some times**	**Often**	**Very Often**
1. habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. made crude and offensive sexual remarks, either publicly (e.g., in the office), or to you privately?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. treated you "differently" because of your sex (e.g., mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. gave you unwanted sexual attention?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (e.g., pictures, stories, or pornography)?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. frequently made sexist remarks (e.g., suggesting that women are too emotional to be scientists or that men should not be the primary caretakers of children because they are not nurturing?)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. attempted to establish a romantic relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage this person?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9. "put you down" or was condescending to you because of your sex?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. has continued to ask you for a date, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you have said "no"?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11. made you feel like you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

	How often did this happen?				
While at the university, have you ever been in a situation where any individuals…	**Never**	**Once**	**Some times**	**Often**	**Very Often**
12. made you feel subtly threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., the mention of an upcoming evaluation, review, etc.)?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13. touched you (e.g., laid a hand on your bare arm, put an arm around your shoulders) in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14. made unwanted attempts to stroke or fondle you (e.g., stroking your leg or neck, etc.)?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
15. made unwanted attempts to have sex with you that resulted in you pleading, crying, or physically struggling?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
16. implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
17. made it necessary for you to respond positively to sexual or social invitations in order to be well-treated on the job or at school?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
18. made you afraid you would be treated poorly if you didn't cooperate sexually?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
19. treated you badly for refusing to have sex?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Note. Total scale score is computed by adding the scores on the 19 items, where responses range from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Subscale scores are calculated by summing the scores on each of the following items: gender harassment (items 1-4,6-7, 9), unwanted sexual attention (items 5,8,10,13-14), and sexual coercion (items 11-12, 15-19).

Appendix D

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Latina

Read each of the situations listed and then check the box that matches how often you have had this experience. Some questions may appear repetitive, but please answer them despite this.

	How often did this happen?				
While at the university, have you ever been in a situation where any individuals…	**Never**	**Once**	**Some times**	**Often**	**Very Often**
20. said things to insult your sex in general?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
21. told jokes or stories that described your sex in general negatively?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
22. told jokes or stories that described Latina/o individuals of your sex negatively?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
23. said things to insult Latina/o individuals of your sex specifically (e.g., saying Latinas are "hot-blooded"/ "loose")?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
24. said offensive things about your body/sex life?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
25. told dirty or sexually offensive stories or jokes?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
26. tried to get you to talk about sexual things?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
27. said crude or gross sexual things, either in front of others or to you alone?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
28. told you about his/her own sex life or sexual preferences?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
29. tried to have a romantic or sexual relationship even though you tried to tell him/her you didn't want to?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
30. kept on asking you out even after you said "no?"	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
31. gave you a sexual "look" that made you feel uncomfortable or dirty?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
32. made you uncomfortable by staring at you (e.g., looking at you too long)?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
33. touched you (e.g., put an arm around your shoulders) in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
34. gave you any sexual attention that you did not want?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
35. made kissing noises or whistled at you?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
36. commented on your physical appearance or clothing in a way that offended or embarrassed you?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
37. slowly looked at your entire body ("looked you up and down")?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

	How often did this happen?				
While at the university, have you ever been in a situation where any individuals…	**Never**	**Once**	**Some times**	**Often**	**Very Often**
38. made you uncomfortable by standing too close?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
39. called you inappropriate "pet names" in Spanish (e.g., "mamacita" or "mi hija")?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Note. Total scale score is computed by adding the scores on the 19 items, where responses range from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Subscale scores are calculated by summing the scores on each of the following items: sexist hostility (items 1-4), sexual hostility (items 5-8), and unwanted sexual attention (items 9-20).

Appendix E

Response Questions

Note: If you indicated once or more than once to any of the behaviors on 1-39, please continue below. If not, please skip to page XX.

40. Of the behaviors listed above (#s 1-39), please indicate which behavior was most upsetting to you by writing the number of the behavior in the following blank:_____

41. Where did this behavior occur (check one)? ☐ in the classroom ☐ in a hallway ☐ on campus elsewhere (specify: _____)

42. How long ago did this behavior occur?_____

42. Who performed the above behavior (check one)?
☐faculty member ☐staff ☐student
☐graduate student who is a Teaching Assistant/Assistant Instructor
☐don't know

44. What is this person's ethnicity (check one)?
☐African-American ☐Asian-American ☐Caucasian ☐Hispanic
☐Native American ☐Other (please list:_____)

45. What is the above person's sex? ☐ Male ☐ Female

46. Do you consider this person a peer? ☐ Yes ☐ No

47. What is this person's approximate age? _____

48. This person is ☐ about my age ☐ younger ☐ older

49. Put into your own words how you responded to this behavior: _____
_____
_____

50. How would you describe your response to this behavior? (check all that apply)
☐Ignored the behavior
☐Avoided the person (e.g., dropped a class, changed majors, stopped going to particular places)
☐Talked to someone (e.g., a friend or family member, therapists, etc)
☐Confronted the person (e.g., told them to stop)
☐Reported the person to someone in authority

51. How pleased/satisfied are you with the way you responded?
☐ very displeased/dissatisfied. ☐ slightly displeased/dissatisfied ☐ neutral
☐ slightly pleased/satisfied ☐ very pleased/satisfied

52. What was the main reason for your choice of response to the behavior? _____
_____
_____

53. If you chose not to report the behavior, what was your reason for doing so?_____
_____
_____

54. If you did report the behavior, where did you report it?_____

55. If you chose to later report a behavior, where would you go?_____

56. What factors played into your decision to report or not report the behavior?_____
_____
_____

Appendix F

Social Power Scales

Refer back to the behavior you indicated in item #40 on p. XX. Please answer the following questions about the person who offended you (referred to as "A" in the following items). In thinking about your relationship with this person, check the square which corresponds best with your thinking about the person.

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1. If I do not comply with A, I will not be rewarded.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Note: Due to copyright laws, a full copy of the instrument cannot be published here. Please obtain a copy from the cited reference (French & Raven, 1959).

Appendix G
PTSD Symptom Scale: Self-Report Version (PSS-SR)

Refer back to the behavior you indicated in item #40 on p. 3. Please answer the following questions. Below is a list of problems that people sometimes have after experiencing an upsetting event(s). Rate each problem with respect to the upsetting behavior you experienced. Read each one carefully and check the appropriate box that best describes how often that problem has bothered you IN THE PAST MONTH.

How often did this happen IN THE PAST MONTH?	**Not at all or only one time**	**Once a week or less, Once in a while**	**2 to 4 times a week, Half the time**	**5 or more times a week, Almost always**
1. Having upsetting thoughts or images about the offensive behavior that came into your head when you didn't want them to	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. Having bad dreams or nightmares about the offensive behavior	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. Reliving the offensive behavior, acting or feeling as if it was happening again	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. Feeling emotionally upset when you were reminded of the offensive behavior (for example, feeling scared, angry, sad, guilty)	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. Experiencing physical reactions when you were reminded of the offensive behavior (for example, breaking out in a sweat, heart beating fast)	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. Trying not to think about, talk about, or have feelings about the offensive behavior	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. Trying to avoid activities, people, or places that remind you of the offensive behavior	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. Not being able to remember an important part of the offensive behavior	❑	❑	❑	❑
9. Having much less interest or participating much less often in important activities	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. Feeling distant or cut off from people around you	❑	❑	❑	❑

How often did this happen IN THE PAST MONTH?	**Not at all or only one time**	**Once a week or less, Once in a while**	**2 to 4 times a week, Half the time**	**5 or more times a week, Almost always**
11. Feeling emotionally numb (for example, being unable to cry or unable to have loving feelings)	❑	❑	❑	❑
12. Feeling as if your future plans or hopes will not come true (for example, you will not have a career, marriage, children, or a long life)	❑	❑	❑	❑
13. Having trouble falling or staying asleep	❑	❑	❑	❑
14. Feeling irritable or having fits of anger	❑	❑	❑	❑
15. Having trouble concentrating (for example, drifting in and out of conversations, losing track of a story on television, forgetting what you read)	❑	❑	❑	❑
16. Being overly alert (for example, checking to see who is around you, being uncomfortable with your back to a door, etc.)	❑	❑	❑	❑
17. Being jumpy or easily startled (for example, when someone walks up behind you	❑	❑	❑	❑

Note. Total scale score is computed by adding the scores on the 17 items, where responses range from 0 (not at all) to 3 (almost always). Subscale scores are calculated by summing the scores on each of the following items: reward power (items 1-6), referent power (items 7-12), information power (items 13-15), coercion power (items 16-20), expertise power (items 21-28), and legitimate power (items 29-31).

Appendix H

Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale

Check the square which best represents how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1. An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. A man must learn to understand that a woman's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no."	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or at work.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious problem.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9.Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11. One of the problems with sexual harassment is that women can't take a joke.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12. The notion that what a professor does in class may be sexual harassment is taking the idea of sexual harassment too far.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13. Many charges of sexual harassment are frivolous and vindictive.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14. A lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16. Sexual harassment refers to those incidents of unwanted sexual attention that aren't too serious.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
17. Sexual harassment has little to do with power.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
18. Sexism and sexual harassment are two completely different things.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
19. All this concern about sexual harassment makes it harder for men and women to have normal relationships.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Note. Total scale score is computed by adding the scores on the 19 items, where responses range from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The following items are reverse-scored: 4 and 7.

Appendix I

Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II)

On the questionnaire below are groups of statements. Please read each group of statements carefully. Then pick out the one statement in each group which best describes the way you have been feeling the PAST WEEK, INCLUDING TODAY! Check the box beside the statement you picked. Be sure to read all the statements in each group before making your choice.

1. ❑I do not feel sad.
   ❑I feel sad much of the time.
   ❑I am sad all the time.
   ❑I am so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.

Note: Due to copyright laws, a full copy of the instrument cannot be published here. Please obtain a copy from the Psychological Corporation.

Appendix J

Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II

Check the square that indicates the extent to which each of the statements applies to you.

	Not at All	**Not Very Often**	**Moderately**	**Very Often**	**Extremely Often**
1. I speak Spanish.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. I speak English.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. I enjoy speaking Spanish.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. I associate with Anglos.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. I associate with Mexicans and/or Mexican Americans	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. I enjoy listening to Spanish language music.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. I enjoy listening to English language music.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. I enjoy Spanish language TV.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9. I enjoy English language TV	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. I enjoy English language movies.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11. I enjoy Spanish language movies.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12. I enjoy reading books in Spanish.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13. I enjoy reading books in English.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14. I write letters in Spanish.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
15. I write letters in English.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
16. My thinking is done in the English language.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
17. My thinking is done in the Spanish language.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
18. My contact with Mexico has been…	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
19. My contact with the USA has been…	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
20. My father identifies/identified himself as Mexicano.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
21. My mother identifies/identified herself as Mexicana.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
22. My friends, while I was growing up, were of Mexican origin.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
23. My friends, while I was growing up, were of Anglo origin.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
24. My family cooks Mexican food.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
25. My friends now are of Anglo origin.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
26. My friends now are of Mexican origin.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
27. I like to identify myself as an Anglo.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
28. I like to identify myself as Mexican American.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
29. I like to identify myself as an American.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
30. I have difficulty accepting some ideas held by Anglos.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
31. I have difficulty accepting certain attitudes held by Anglos.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

	Not at All	Not Very Often	Moderately	Very Often	Extremely Often
32. I have difficulty accepting some behaviors exhibited by Anglos.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
33. I have difficulty accepting some values held by some Anglos.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
34. I have difficulty accepting certain practices and customs commonly found in some Anglos.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
35. I have, or think I would have, difficulty accepting Anglos as close personal friends.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
36. I have difficulty accepting ideas held by some Mexicans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
37. I have difficulty accepting certain attitudes held by Mexicans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
38. I have difficulty accepting some behavior exhibited by Mexicans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
39. I have difficulty accepting some values held by Mexicans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
40. I have difficulty accepting certain practices and customs commonly found in some Mexicans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
41. I have, or think I would have, difficulty accepting Mexicans as close personal friends.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
42. I have difficulty accepting ideas held by some Mexican Americans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
43. I have difficulty accepting certain attitudes held by Mexican Americans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
44. I have difficulty accepting some behavior exhibited by Mexican Americans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
45. I have difficulty accepting some values held by Mexican Americans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
46. I have difficulty accepting certain practices and customs commonly found in some Mexican Americans.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
47. I have, or think I would have, difficulty accepting Mexican Americans as close personal friends.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Note. The subscale scores are calculated by summing the scores on each of the following items: Anglo Orientation (items 2,4,7,9,10,13,15,16,19,23,25,27,29), Mexican Orientation (items 1,3,5,6,8,11,12,14,17,18,20,21,22,24,26,28), Anglo Marginality (items 30-35), Mexican Marginality (items 36-41), and Mexican American Marginality (items 42-47). Scores range from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely often).

Appendix K

Item Means and Standard Deviations for All Scales

	Mexican American		Caucasian		Total	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
SEQ Total*	.36	.42	.45	.47	.38	.44
Gender Harass.	.59	.64	.74	.77	.63	.68
Unwant. Sex. Att.	.45	.64	.59	.72	.49	.67
Sexual Coercion	.06	.20	.05	.15	.06	.19
SEQ-L Total*	.55	.58	.70	.67	.59	.61
Sexist Hostility	.53	.71	.55	.70	.54	.71
Sexual Hostility	.56	.76	.81	.87	.63	.80
Unwant. Sex. Att.	.57	.63	.74	.74	.62	.67
Social Power Total*	1.37	.55	1.50	.55	1.41	.55
Reward Power	1.42	.73	1.48	.72	1.44	.72
Referent Power	1.38	.66	1.59	.78	1.44	.70
Inform. Power	1.50	.83	1.69	.84	1.56	.83
Coercion Power	1.29	.59	1.38	.73	1.31	.64
Expert Power	1.43	.71	1.55	.65	1.31	.64
Legitimate Power	1.21	.49	1.30	.68	1.24	.55
PTSD Total*	.14	.25	.16	.29	.15	.26
SHAS Total*	3.62	.54	3.50	.53	3.58	.54
BDI Total*	.39	.41	.30	.29	.37	.38
ARSMA-II*						
Anglo Orientation	3.93	.46	4.61	.33	4.13	.53
Mexican Orient.	3.41	.79	1.81	.45	2.93	1.02
Anglo Marginality	2.22	.75	2.02	.76	2.16	.76
Mex. Marginality	2.12	.76	2.32	.79	2.18	.77
Mex. Am. Margin	1.94	.74	2.17	.81	2.01	.77

Note. SEQ and SEQ-L responses range from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Social Power from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). PTSD and BDI from 0 (not at all) to 3 (almost always). SHAS from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). ARSMA-II from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely often).

Appendix L

A Comparison of Schools on Experiences of Sexually Harassing Behaviors

School	Scale	Mexican American		Caucasian		Total	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
UT Austin	SEQ Total	.36	.35	.45	.45	.41	.41
	Gender Harass.	.56	.55	.75	.78	.37	.70
	Unwant. Sex. Att.	.48	.58	.62	.70	.56	.66
	Sexual Coercion	.08	.20	.03	.12	.05	.16
	SEQ-L Total	.63	.58	.71	.66	.68	.63
	Sexist Hostility	.49	.68	.51	.71	.50	.69
	Sexual Hostility	.61	.74	.81	.90	.73	.83
	Unwant. Sex. Att.	.69	.67	.75	.68	.72	.67
UT Brownsville	SEQ Total	.22	.31	.13	.18	.22	.31
	Gender Harass.	.39	.54	.29	.39	.38	.53
	Unwant. Sex. Att.	.26	.51	.08	.18	.25	.50
	Sexual Coercion	.03	.14	.00	.00	.03	.13
	SEQ-L Total	.35	.43	.26	.37	.35	.43
	Sexist Hostility	.34	.57	.55	.76	.35	.57
	Sexual Hostility	.30	.61	.30	.45	.30	.60
	Unwant. Sex. Att.	.37	.49	.15	.22	.36	.48
St. Mary's - San Antonio	SEQ Total	.49	.52	.44	.52	.48	.52
	Gender Harass.	.79	.77	.69	.79	.77	.77
	Unwant. Sex. Att.	.64	.81	.59	.82	.63	.81
	Sexual Coercion	.08	.22	.06	.16	.07	.21
	SEQ-L Total	.75	.68	.66	.70	.73	.69
	Sexist Hostility	.74	.77	.60	.70	.71	.75
	Sexual Hostility	.85	.88	.77	.91	.83	.88
	Unwant. Sex. Att.	.72	.74	.64	.76	.71	.74

Note. SEQ and SEQ-L responses range from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Item mean scores are reported. A two-way MANOVA was run with the subscales as the dependent variables and ethnicity of student and school as independent variables. No significant differences were found.

Appendix M

Frequency of Harassing Behaviors Experienced by All Participants

SEQ/SEQ L Item	Never	Once	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
1. habitually told suggestive stories or offensive/jokes	46.3%	9.3%	33.0%	7.6%	3.8%
2. made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters	68.0%	8.7%	18.3%	3.3%	1.6%
3. made crude and offensive sexual remarks, either publicly or privately	70.5%	4.4%	17.8%	2.5%	1.9%
4. treated you differently because of your sex	66.7%	10.4%	16.7%	4.1%	2.2%
5. gave you unwanted sexual attention	69.1%	7.7%	17.7%	4.4%	1.1%
6. displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials	86.1%	6.8%	6.3%	.5%	.3%
7. frequently made sexist remarks	56.5%	9.2%	26.9%	5.2%	2.2%
8. attempted to establish a romantic relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage the person	66.3%	15.9%	14.8%	2.2%	.8%
9. put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex	74.7%	12.9%	10.2%	1.9%	.3%
10. has continued to ask you for a date, drinks, dinner, etc. even though you have said no	68.6%	10.4%	15.3%	5.5%	.3%
11. made you feel like you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior	91.3%	5.2%	3.3%	.3%	0%
12. made you feel subtly threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative	97.6%	1.1%	.5%	.5%	.3%
13. touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	68.8%	14.7%	14.7%	1.1%	.8%
14. made unwanted attempts to stroke or fondle you?	84.5%	8.4%	6.8%	.3%	0%
15. made unwanted attempts to have sex with you that resulted in you pleading, crying, or physically struggling?	97.3%	2.4%	.3%	0%	0%

SEQ/SEQ L Item	Never	Once	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
16. implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
17. made it necessary to respond positively to sexual or social invitations in order to be well-treated on the job or at school	95.9%	1.9%	1.9%	.3%	0%
18. made you afraid you would be treated poorly if you didn't cooperate sexually	97.0%	1.6%	1.1%	.3%	0%
19. treated you badly for refusing to have sex	93.2%	4.1%	2.4%	.3%	0%
20. said things to insult your sex in general	69.0%	8.2%	20.3%	1.9%	.5%
21. told jokes or stories that described your sex in general negatively	62.8%	10.1%	21.9%	3.8%	1.4%
22. said things to insult Latina/o individuals of your sex negatively	74.0%	7.1%	15.3%	2.7%	.8%
23. said thing to insult Latina/o individuals of your sex specifically	74.1%	9.0%	16.1%	.8%	0%
24. said offensive things about your body/sex life	77.3%	7.8%	13.0%	1.9%	0%
25. told dirty or sexually offensive stories or jokes	54.9%	10.1%	26.8%	5.7%	2.5%
26. tried to get you to talk about sexual things	68.3%	6.1%	19.8%	5.0%	.8%
27. said crude or gross sexual things, either in front of others or to you alone	67.6%	6.3%	18.7%	5.8%	1.6%
28. told you about his/her own sex life or sexual preferences	52.9%	8.2%	25.6%	11.2%	2.2%
29. tried to have a romantic or sexual relationship even though you tried to tell him/her you didn't want to	80.1%	10.9%	7.7%	1.4%	0%
30. kept on asking you out even after you said no	73.4%	10.7%	12.6%	2.7%	.5%
31. gave you a sexual look that made you feel uncomfortable or dirty	65.5%	12.2%	18.2%	2.4%	1.6%
32. made you uncomfortable by staring at you	53.1%	15.0%	26.2%	4.1%	1.6%

SEQ/SEQ L Item	Never	Once	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
33. touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	72.8%	12.3%	12.8%	1.6%	.5%
34. gave you any sexual attention that you did not want	73.0%	8.7%	15.0%	2.7%	.5%
35. made kissing noises or whistled at you	62.4%	7.9%	21.5%	7.1%	1.1%
36. commented on your physical appearance or clothing in way that offended or embarrassed you	71.1%	8.2%	16.6%	3.5%	.5%
37. slowly looked at your entire body	52.2%	9.9%	29.7%	5.8%	2.5%
38. made you uncomfortable by standing too close	59.9%	13.9%	21.0%	4.4%	.8%
39. called you inappropriate pet names in Spanish	76.8%	5.4%	13.1%	4.4%	.3%

References

Adams, J., Kottke, J., & Padgitt, J. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24,* 484-490.

Adams-Ray, J. & Barling, J. (1998). Predicting the decision to confront or report sexual harassment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19,* 329-336.

Aguinis, H., Nesler, M.S., Quigley, B. M., Lee, S. J., & Tedeschi, J.T. (1996). Power bases of faculty supervisors and educational outcomes for graduate students. *Journal of Higher Education, 67(3),* 267-298.

American Association of University Women (AAUW) (1993). *Hostile hallways: The AAUW survey on sexual harassment in schools.* Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation.

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-IV, 4th ed.)* Washington, DC: Author.

Barak, A. (1997). Cross-cultural perspectives on sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and treatment* (pp. 263-300). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Barak, A., Fisher, W.A., & Houston, S. (1992). Individual difference correlates of the experience of sexual harassment among female university students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22,* 17-37.

Beck, A. T., Steer, R.A., & Brown, G. K. (1996). *Beck Depression Inventory-II.* San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

Beere, C. A. (1990).*Gender roles: A handbook of tests and measures.* New York:

Greenwood Press.

Bingham, S. G., & Scherer, L. L. (2001) The unexpected effects of a sexual harassment educational program. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37,* 125-153.

Bowes-Sperry, L. & Tata, J. (1999). Sexual harassment: A review of two decades of research. In G. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Burgos, N.M, & Perez, Y.I. (1986). An exploration of human sexuality in the Puerto Rican culture. *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality, 4,* 135-150.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1989). Effects of message repetition on argument processing, recall, and persuasion. *Basic and Applied Psychology, 10,* 3-12.

Cammaert, L. P. (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? *International Journal of Women's Studies, 8(4),* 388-397.

Carson, P.P., Carson, K.D., & Roe, C. W. (1993). Social power bases: A meta-analytic examination of interrelationships and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23,* 1150-1169.

Cleveland, J. N., & Kerst, M.E. (1993). Sexual harassment and perceptions of power: An under-articulated relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42(1),* 49-67.

Cochran, C.C., Frazier, P.A., & Olson, A. U. (1997). Predictors of responses to unwanted sexual attention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21,* 207-226.

Collins, P.H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* Boston: Irwin Hyman.

Cortina, L.M. (2001). Assessing sexual harassment among Latinas: Development of an

instrument. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7(2),* 164-181.

Cortina, L.M., Swan, S., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Waldo, C. (1998). Sexual harassment and assault: Chilling the climate for women in academia. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 419-441.

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans II: A revision of the original ARSMA Scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17(3),* 275-304.

Dall'Ara, E., & Maass, A. (1999). Studying sexual harassment in the laboratory: Are egalitarian women at higher risk? *Sex Roles, 41 (9-10),* 681-704.Dansky, B. S. &

Kilpatrick, D. G. (1997). Effects of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp.152-174). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Davis, K. (1991). Critical sociology and gender relations. In K. Davis, M. Leijenaar, & J. Oldersma (Eds.), *The gender of power* (pp. 65-86). London: Sage.

DeFour, D. C. (1996). The interface of racism and sexism on college campuses. In M.A. Paludi (Ed.), *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 49-55) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Desouza, E.R., & Hutz, C.S. (1996). Reactions to refusals of sexual advances among U.S. & Brazilian men and women. *Sex Roles, 34*, 549-565.

Donovan, M.A., & Drasgow, F.D. (1997, April). *Establishing the measurement*

equivalence of a measure of sexual harassment across five samples: A multiple comparison of differential item functioning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, MO.

Dziech, B.W., & Hawkins, M.W. (1998). *Sexual harassment in higher education: Reflections and new perspectives.* New York: Garland Publishing.

Dziech, B.W., & Weiner, L. (1990). *The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Feld, A. (1987). Self-perceptions of power: Do social work and business students differ? *Social Work, 32(3),* 225-230.

Fitzgerald, L.F. (1990). Sexual harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In M.A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 21-44). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., & Gelfand, M.J. (1993). Sexual experiences questionnaire, form W(E). Unpublished research scale. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Psychology.

Fitzgerald, L.F., Gelfand, M.J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17(4),* 425-445.

Fitzgerald, L.F., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1989). The dimensions of sexual harassment: A structural analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35*, 309-326.

Fitzgerald, L.F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual

harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*, 152-175.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51 (1)*, 117-138.

Foa, E. B., Riggs, D. S., Dancu, C. V., & Rothbaum, B. O. (1993). Reliability and validity of a brief instrument for assessing post-traumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 6,* 459-473.

Ford, C. A.., & Donis, F. J. (1996). The relationship between age and gender in worker's attitudes towards sexual harassment. *Journal of Psychology, 130,* 627-633.

French, J.R., & Raven, B. (1959). The basis of social power. In D.C. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Frost, D.E., & Stahelski, A.J. (1988). The systematic measurement of French and Raven's bases of social power in workgroups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 375-389.

Gelfand, M.J., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory factor analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47(2),* 164-177.

Giuffre, P.A., & Williams, C. L. (1994). Boundary lines: Labeling sexual harassment in restaurants. *Gender and Society, 8,* 378-401.

Glomb, T.M., Munson, L.J., Hulin, C. L., Bergman, M.E., & Drasgow, F. (1999).

Structural equation models of sexual harassment: Longitudinal explorations and cross-sectional generalizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 14-28.

Graczyk, M. (1998, June 10). Three whites held in black man's dragging death: Sheriff says East Texas killing was racially motivated. *Austin American Statesman,* pp. A1.

Gruber, J. E., & Bjorn, L. (1986). Women's responses to sexual harassment: An analysis of sociocultural, organizational, and personal resource models. *Social Science Quarterly, 67 (4)*, 814-826.

Gutek, B. (1985). *Sex and the workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutek, B. A., & Done, R.S. (2001). Sexual harassment. In R. K. Unger (Ed.), *Handbook of the psychology of women and gender* (pp. 367-387). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gutek, B., & Koss, M. (1993). Changed women and changed organizations: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 28-48.

Gutek, B.A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues, 38(4),* 55-74.

Hamilton, J. A., Alagna, S. W., King, L.S., & Lloyd, C. (1987). The emotional consequences of gender-based abuse in the workplace: New counseling programs for sex discrimination. *Women and Therapy, 6*, 155-182.

Hemming, H. (1985). Women in a man's world: Sexual harassment. *Human Relations, 38*, 67-69.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C.A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven (1959) bases of social power. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 561-567.

Holgate, A. (1989). Sexual harassment as a determinant of women's fear of rape. *Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage, and the Family, 10*, 21-28.

Jones, T.S., & Remland, M.A. (1992). Sources of variability in perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 27*, 121-142.

Kalof, L., Eby, K.K., Matheson, J.L., & Kroska, R.J. (2001). The influence of race and gender on student self-reports on sexual harassment by college professors. *Gender & Society, 15 (2),* 282-302.

Kearney L. K., Rochlen, A. B., & King, E. B. (2004). Male gender role conflict, sexual harassment tolerance, and the efficacy of a psychoeducative training program. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 5(1),* 72-82.

Kranau, E. J., Green, V., & Valencia-Weber, G. (1982). Acculturation and the Hispanic woman: Attitudes toward women, sex-role attribution, sex-role behavior, and demographics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 4(1),* 21-40.

Leaper, C., & Valin, D. (1996). Predictors of Mexican American mothers' and fathers' attitudes toward gender equality. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18(3),* 343-355.

Legnick-Hall, M.L. (1995). Sexual harassment research: A methodological critique. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 841-864.

Lenhart, S. (1996). Physical and mental health aspects of sexual harassment. In D. K.

Shrier (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace & academia: Psychiatric issues.* (pp. 21-38). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sexual discrimination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Magley, V. J., Hulin, C. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of self-labeling harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(3),* 390-402.

Marin, B.V., & Gomez, C.A. (1996). Sex and culture: Implications for AIDS prevention. In J. Garcia & M.C. Zea (Eds.), *Handbook of Latino psychology*. Meedham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles, 20,* 135-147.

Mecca, S. J., & Rubin, L.J. (1999). Definitional research on African-American students and sexual harassment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23(4),* 813-817.

Murrell, A. J. (1996). Sexual harassment and women of color: Issues, challenges, and future directions. In M.S. Stockdale (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace: Perspectives, frontiers, and response strategies* (pp. 51-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Nesler, M.S., Aguinis, H., Quigley, B.M., & Tedeschi, J.T. (1993). The effect of credibility on perceived power. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23,* 1407-1425.

Nesler, M.S., Aguinis, H., Quigley, B.M., Lee, S.J., & Tedeschi, J.T. (1999). The

development and validation of a scale measuring global social power based on French and Raven's power taxonomy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29(4),* 750-771.

Niebuhr, R. H., & Boyles, W.R. (1991). Sexual harassment of military personnel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 445-457.

Oaks, R., & Landrum-Brown, J. (1997). Cross cultural issues and influences. In B.R. Sandler & R. J. Shoop (Eds.), *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students* (pp. 214-233). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

O'Donohue, W. (Ed.). (1997). *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

O'Guinn, T.C., Imperia, G., & MacAdams, E.A. (1987). Acculturation and perceived family decision-making input among Mexican American wives. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18(1),* 78-92.

O'Hare, E.A., & O'Donahue, W. (1998). Sexual harassment: Identifying risk factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 27(6),* 561-563.

Paludi, M.A. (1996). *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Paludi, M.A., & Barickman, R.B. (1991). *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A resource manual.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pavich, E.G. (1986). A Chicana perspective on Mexican culture and sexuality. *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality, 4,* 47-65.

Perry, E. L., Kulik, C. T. & Schmidtke, J. M. (1998). Individual differences in the

effectiveness of sexual harassment awareness training. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28,* 698-723.

Project on the Status and Education of Women (PSEW)(1986). *In case of sexual harassment: A guide for women students.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Pryor, J. (1985). The lay person's understanding of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 13,* 273-286.

Pryor, J.B., DeSouza, E.R., Fitness, J., Hutz, C., Kumpf, M., Lubbert, K., Personen, O., & Erber, M.W. (1997). Gender differences in the interpretation of social-sexual behavior: A cross-cultural perspective on sexual harassment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28 (5),* 509-534.

Quina, K., & Carlson, N.L. (1989). *Rape, incest, and sexual harassment: A guide for helping survivors.* New York: Praeger.

Rabinowitz, V.C. (1990). Coping with sexual harassment. In M.A. Paludi (Ed.*) Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power,* (pp.199-213). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rahim, M.A. (1988). The development of a leader power inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 23,* 491-503.

Rahim, M.A. (1989). Relationships of leader power to compliance and satisfaction with supervision: Evidence from a national sample of managers. *Journal of Management, 15,* 545-556.

Rahim, M.A., & Afza, M. (1993). Leader power, commitment, satisfaction, compliance,

and propensity to leave a job among U.S. accountants. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133,* 611-625.

Reilly, M.E., Lott, B., & Gallogly, S. M. (1986). Sexual harassment of university students. *Sex Roles, 15,* 333-358.

Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J.A., & Nawyn, S.J. (1998). Doing power: The confluence of gender, race, and class in contrapower sexual harassment. *Gender & Society, 12(1),* 40-61.

Salisbury, J., Ginorio, A. B., Remick, H., & Stringer, D. M. (1986). Counseling victims of sexual harassment. *Psychotherapy, 23(2),* 316-324.

Sandler, B.R., & Shoop, R.J. (1997). What is sexual harassment? In B.R. Sandler & R.J. Shoop (Eds.) *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students* (pp. 1-21). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Scollay, J.S., & Bratt, C.S. (1997). Untying the gordian knot of academic sexual harassment. In B.R. Sandler & R.J. Shoop (Eds.), *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students* (pp. 261-277). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Segura, D.A. (1992). Chicanos in white color jobs: "You have to prove yourself more." *Sociological Perspectives, 35,* 163-182.

Shaffer, B., Percy, P.M., & Tepper, B.J. (1997). Further assessment of the Hinkin and Schriesheim's measures of interpersonal power. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57,* 505-514.

Shelton, J. N., & Chavous, T.M. (1999). Black and white college women's perceptions of

sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 40*, 593-615.

Sheridan, J.E., & Vredenburgh, D.J. (1978). Usefulness of leadership behavior and social power variables in predicting job tension, performance, and turn-over for nursing employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*, 89-95.

Shrier, D. K. (1996). *Sexual harassment in the workplace & academia: Psychiatric issues.* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Shupe, E. I., Cortina, L.M., Ramos, A., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Salisbury, J. (2002). The incidence and outcomes of sexual harassment among Hispanic and non-Hispanic white women: A comparison across levels of cultural affiliation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 298-308.

Skaine, R. (1996). *Power and gender: Issues in sexual dominance and harassment.* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.

Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (3rd ed.).* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stockdale, M.S. (1996). What we know and what we need to learn about sexual harassment. In M.S. Stockdale (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace: Perspectives, frontiers, and response strategies* (pp. 3-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stockdale, M.S., Vaux, A., & Cashin, J. (1995). Acknowledging sexual harassment: A test of alternative models. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17,* 469-496.

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1999). Counseling Hispanic Americans. In D.W. Sue & D. Sue

(Eds.), *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (pp. 286-303). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Swasy, J.L. (1979). Measuring the bases of social power. In W. L. Wilkie (Ed.). *Advances in consumer research* (Vol. 6, pp. 340-346). Ann Arbor, MI: Associations for Consumer Research.

Tangri, S., Burt, M., & Johnson, L. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*, 33-54.

Taylor, P.L., Tucker, M.B., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1999). Ethnic variations in perceptions of men's provider role. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 741-761.

Thacker, R. A., & Gohmann, S.F. (1996). Emotional and psychological consequences of sexual harassment: A descriptive study. *The Journal of Psychology, 130(4),* 420-446.

Till, F. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students.* Washington, D. C.: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.

Tong, R. (1984). *Women, sex, and the law.* Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1992). Population projections of the United States, by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1992 to 2050. In *Current population reports* (pp. 25-1092) Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1987). *Sexual harassment of federal workers: An update*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1988). *Sexual harassment in the federal*

workplace: An update. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Wyatt, G.E., & Riederle, M. (1994). Sexual harassment and prior sexual trauma among African- American and White American women. *Violence and Victims, 9*, 233-247.

Yukl, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G.A., & Falbe, C.M. (1991). Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 416-423.

VITA

Lisa Kathryn Kearney was born in Ft. Hood, Texas, on October 6, 1973, the daughter of Ingelore Helen Uhlmann Gillian and Lamar Benton Gillian, Jr. After completing her high school education in 1991 at Incarnate Word High School, San Antonio, Texas, she attended the University of Texas at Austin, where she received her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology with a minor in Educational Psychology in 1994. She then pursued a Master's of Arts in Christian Education at Dallas Theological Seminary, which she received in 1997. During this time period and after her graduation, she taught middle school at Liberty Christian High, a Microsoft laptop school, in Dallas, Texas. She then attended graduate school at St. Mary's University, San Antonio, and received a Master's of Arts in Community Counseling in 2000. During this time period, she was also an adjunct faculty member at St. Mary's University and St. Philip's Community College. In August 2000, she entered the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin to pursue a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology with a concentration in Counseling Psychology. During her studies at the University of Texas, she has published three articles on feminist family therapy with adolescents, sexual harassment education and gender role conflict, and an educational intervention to improve middle school girls' competency in technology and decrease technologically related gender bias in the classroom.

Permanent Address: 3043 Colony Drive, San Antonio, Texas 78230

This dissertation was typed by the author.